Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

PUBLIC LAW 86-149

H. R. 5674

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 5674.....1

Digest of Public Law 86-149.....2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 5674

Feb. 11, 1959	Rep. Vinson introduced H. R. 4414 which was referred to House Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced.
Feb. 17, 1959	Senator Russell introduced S. 1086 which was referred to Senate Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced.
Mar. 13, 1959	Rep. Vinson introduced H. R. 5674 which was referred to House Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced.
Mar. 17, 1959	House committee ordered H. R. 5674 reported with amendment.
Mar. 18, 1959	House committee reported H. R. 5674 with amendments. House Report 223. Print of bill and House report.
Apr. 15, 1959	Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 5674. House Resolution 245 and House Report 272. Print of resolution and House report.
Apr. 16, 1959	House passed H. R. 5674 with amendments.
Apr. 17, 1959	H. R. 5674 was referred to Senate Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as referred.
May 13, 1959	Senate committee ordered H. R. 5674 reported with amendment.
May 19, 1959	Senate committee reported H. R. 5674 with amendment. Senate Report 296. Print of bill and Senate report.
May 20, 1959	Senate passed over H. R. 5674.
June 12, 1959	Senate passed over H. R. 5674.
June 25, 1959	Senate made H. R. 5674 the unfinished business.
	Senate committee reported S. 2280, an original bill. Senate Report 434. Print of bill and Senate report.
June 30, 1959	Senate passed H. R. 5674 with amendments.
	Senate appointed conferees.

July 1, 1959	House appointed conferees on H. R. 5674.
July 29, 1959	House received the conference report on H. R. 5674. House Report 729. Print of House report.
July 30, 1959	Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5674.
Aug. 10, 1959	Approved: Public Law 86-149.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 86-149

USE OF PUBLIC LAW 480 FUNDS FOR FOREIGN MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Authorizes construction projects at military installations. Authorizes the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at designated foreign locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Requires that foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480, to the extent available and feasible, shall be used in lieu of dollars in carrying out in a foreign country any project authorized by this Act or any other Military Construction Act heretofore or hereafter enacted.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4414

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 11, 1959

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

---

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $730,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,387,000.

Savannah Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,748,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

Columbus General Depot, Ohio: Utilities, $2,783,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $3,699,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,366,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $150,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance

facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,747,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $958,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities and real estate, $2,636,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $8,049,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $553,000.

Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Baywood Park, California: Real estate, $144,000

Fort Ord, California: Supply facilities, $85,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,417,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.

Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $29,026,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259,000.

Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.

Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including

land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $99,330,000.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $17,500,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.

Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.

Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.

Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.

Fort Ord, California, 500 units.

Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading, "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $1,350,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,417,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field,

Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,576,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $462,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,897,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona:

Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,940,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,196,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,050,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeuene, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $11,934,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $781,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisi-

tion, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $21,765,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $17,500,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 250 units.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000". (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" with respect to the Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida, by striking out "$170,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,374,000", and "$461,086,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and

inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and "$337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,814,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, and real estate, $976,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $598,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,419,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs Area, Colorado: Operational facilities, $10,000,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,234,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $357,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $925,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $1,750,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,303,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,054,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,528,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $787,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,117,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, $3,125,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,598,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-

tional facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,741,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,193,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $21,810,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilites, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Maintenance facilities, $709,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $1,948,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,892,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,458,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,260,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $855,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyo-

ming: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $1,523,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,711,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $1,066,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $6,165,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,505,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Op-

erational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,800,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $2,222,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Supply facilities, $93,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $672,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $3,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North

Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $715,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $97,257,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,566,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $1,299,000.

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,953,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $22,633,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Supply facilities, and utilities, $374,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $16,926,000.

UNITED STATES SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for

ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $443,541,000.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authoriza-

tion will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified location, 333 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to

construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 300 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 300 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 300 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 470 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 285 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 260 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 400 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 320 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 550 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 300 units.

Schilling Air Force Base, Kansas, 240 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 400 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85–685, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base,

Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $90,212,000; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $99,330,000; section 103, $17,500,000; or a total of $231,252,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $114,514,000; outside the United States, $41,505,000; section 202, $21,765,000; section 203, $17,500,000; or a total of $195,284,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $332,664,000; outside the United States, $79,056,000; section 302, $443,541,000; section 303, $17,500,000; or a total of $872,761,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary

of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained

in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343) ;

(6) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended;

(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 507 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328) ;

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328) ;

(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994) ;

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994) ;

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,-

000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the

Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall

be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. Section 407 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 407. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, may occupy on a rental basis, without loss of basic allowance for quarters, inadequate Government-owned quarters under the jurisdiction of any of the uniformed services which have been constructed, converted, or designated for assignment as public quarters. The net difference between the basic allowance for quarters and the fair rental value of such quarters shall be paid from otherwise available appropriations.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall be administered under regulations approved by the President.

"(c) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the respective military departments, the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department, the Secretary of Commerce for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Public Health Service (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretaries'), are each authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to (b) above, to designate as rental housing Government-owned housing which has been constructed, converted, or designated for assignment as public quarters and which he determines to be inadequate for such purposes.

"(d) The Secretaries are each further authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to subsection (b) above, to lease inadequate Government-owned housing to personnel of any of the mentioned services for occupancy by them and their dependents. The housing facilities leased, as herein provided, shall have either been constructed or converted for assignment as public quarters with funds derived from appropriations made for such purposes, or else designated for assignment as public quarters.

"(e) All housing units determined pursuant to subsec-

tion (c) of this section to be inadequate shall, prior to July 1, 1961, either be altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, or be demolished or otherwise disposed of.

"(f) This section shall have no application to any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

"(g) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or affect the authority contained in the Act of July 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 316)."

SEC. 410. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of

1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 411. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 412. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 413. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78) is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000."

SEC. 414. (a) Section 2662, title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The analysis of chapter 159, title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following item:

"2662. Real property transactions: agreement with Armed Services Committees; reports."

(c) Section 43 of the Act of August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 636) is repealed.

SEC. 415. Titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.

Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.

Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.

Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.

Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.

Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.

Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.

Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.

Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.

Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.

Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.

East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.

El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.

Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.

Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.

Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities: $168,000.

Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.

Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.

Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.

Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.

Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.

New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.

Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.

Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.

Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.

Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.

San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.

San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.

San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.

Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.

Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.

Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.

Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.

Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.

Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.

Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.

Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.

Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.

Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.

Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.

Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.

Colville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.

Dover, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.

Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.

Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.

Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.

Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.

Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.

Logan, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.

Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.

Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.

Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.

Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.

Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.

Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Riverdale, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.

Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.

Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.

San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.

Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.

Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.

Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.

Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.

Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.

Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities and operational facilities, $364,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and troop housing, $188,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Utilities and ground improvements, $4,963,000.

Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $426,000.

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $192,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided,* That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 3 of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."

"Hammonton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."

"Pitman, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85-685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000;" and by striking out in clause (2) (b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place thereof "$12,446,000;" and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,352,000".

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or

temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army Reserve, $20,748,000;

(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,316,000;

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, $15,536,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1) (a), (1) (b), (2), (3) (a), and (3) (b) of section 504, respectively.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959."

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4414

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

FEBRUARY 11, 1959

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1086

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 17, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $730,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,387,000.

Savannah Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,748,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

Columbus General Depot, Ohio: Utilities, $2,783,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $3,699,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,366,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $150,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance

facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,747,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $958,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities and real estate, $2,636,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $8,049,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $553,000.

Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Baywood Park, California: Real estate, $144,000

Fort Ord, California: Supply facilities, $85,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,417,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.

Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $29,026,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259,000.

Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.

Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including

land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $99,330,000.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations;

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.

Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.

Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.

Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.

Fort Ord, California, 500 units.

Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading, "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $1,350,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities. $3,417,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field,

Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,576,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $462,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,897,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona:

Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,940,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,196,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,050,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeuene, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $11,934,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $781,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisi-

tion, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $21,765,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 250 units.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000". (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" with respect to the Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida, by striking out "$170,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,374,000"; and "$461,086,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and

inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and "$337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,814,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, and real estate, $976,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $598,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,419,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs Area, Colorado: Operational facilities, $10,000,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,234,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $357,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $925,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $1,750,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,303,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,054,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,528,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $787,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,117,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, $3,125,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,598,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-

tional facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,741,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,193,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $21,810,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilites, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Maintenance facilities, $709,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $1,948,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,892,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,458,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,260,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $855,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyo-

ming: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $1,523,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,711,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $1,066,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $6,165,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,505,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Op-

erational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,800,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $2,222,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Supply facilities, $93,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $672,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $3,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North

Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $715,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $97,257,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,566,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $1,299,000.

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,953,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $22,633,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Supply facilities, and utilities, $374,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $16,926,000.

UNITED STATES SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for

ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $443,541,000.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $17,500,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authoriza-

tion will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified location, 333 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to

construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 300 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 300 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 300 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 470 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 285 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 260 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 400 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 320 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 550 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 300 units.

Schilling Air Force Base, Kansas, 240 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 400 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85–685, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base,

Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $90,212,000; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $99,330,000; section 103, $17,500,000; or a total of $231,252,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $114,514,000; outside the United States, $41,505,000; section 202, $21,765,000; section 203, $17,500,000; or a total of $195,284,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $332,664,000; outside the United States, $79,056,000; section 302, $443,541,000; section 303, $17,500,000; or a total of $872,761,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary

of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained

in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343) ;

(6) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended;

(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 507 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328) ;

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328) ;

(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994) ;

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994) ;

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,-

000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the

Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall

be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. Section 407 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 407. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, may occupy on a rental basis, without loss of basic allowance for quarters, inadequate Government-owned quarters under the jurisdiction of any of the uniformed services which have been constructed, converted, or designated for assignment as public quarters. The net difference between the basic allowance for quarters and the fair rental value of such quarters shall be paid from otherwise available appropriations.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall be administered under regulations approved by the President.

"(c) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the respective military departments, the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department, the Secretary of Commerce for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Public Health Service (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretaries'), are each authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to (b) above, to designate as rental housing Government-owned housing which has been constructed, converted, or designated for assignment as public quarters and which he determines to be inadequate for such purposes.

"(d) The Secretaries are each further authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to subsection (b) above, to lease inadequate Government-owned housing to personnel of any of the mentioned services for occupancy by them and their dependents. The housing facilities leased, as herein provided, shall have either been constructed or converted for assignment as public quarters with funds derived from appropriations made for such purposes, or else designated for assignment as public quarters.

"(e) All housing units determined pursuant to subsec-

tion (c) of this section to be inadequate shall, prior to July 1, 1961, either be altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, or be demolished or otherwise disposed of.

"(f) This section shall have no application to any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

"(g) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or affect the authority contained in the Act of July 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 316)."

SEC. 410. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of

1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 411. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 412. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 413. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78) is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000."

SEC. 414. (a) Section 2662, title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The analysis of chapter 159, title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following item:

"2662. Real property transactions: agreement with Armed Services Committees; reports."

(c) Section 43 of the Act of August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 636) is repealed.

SEC. 415. Titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.

Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.

Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.

Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.

Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.

Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.

Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.

Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.

Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.

Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.

Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.

East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.

El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.

Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.

Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.

Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities: $168,000.

Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.

Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.

Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.

Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.

Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.

New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.

Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.

Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.

Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.

Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.

San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.

San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.

San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.

Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.

Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.

Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.

Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.

Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.

Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.

Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.

Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.

Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.

Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.

Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.

Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.

Colville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.

Dover, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.

Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.

Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.

Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.

Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.

Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.

Logan, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.

Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.

Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.

Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.

Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.

Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.

Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Riverdale, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.

Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.

Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.

San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.

Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.

Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.

Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.

Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.

Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.

Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities and operational facilities, $364,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and troop housing, $188,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Utilities and ground improvements, $4,963,000.

Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $426,000.

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $192,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided*, That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000,"

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 3 of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."

"Hammonton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."

"Pitman, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000;" and by striking out in clause (2) (b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place thereof "$12,446,000;" and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,352,000".

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or

temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army Reserve, $20,748,000;

(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,316,000;

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, $15,536,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1) (a), (1) (b), (2), (3) (a), and (3) (b) of section 504, respectively.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959."

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1086

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. SALTONSTALL

FEBRUARY 17, 1959
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

S. 1086

A BILL

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5674

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 13, 1959

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,387,000.

Savannah Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $3,230,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,866,000.

Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina: Family housing, $251,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,747,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facility, $1,228,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $2,662,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,260,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $593,000.

Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Ord, California: Supply facilities, $85,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.

Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $29,026,000:

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259.000.

Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.

Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $83,330,000.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may estab-

lish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Commit-

tees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.

Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.

Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.

Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.

Fort Ord, California, 500 units.

Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,497,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,897,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,940,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,196,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,050,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real Estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITES

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $11,934,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $781,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $21,765,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved produc-

tion schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 250 units.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000". (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-

tion 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES

(Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and $337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site prepa-

ration, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,078,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $225,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,303,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,458,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $542,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:

Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $2,258,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,598,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,741,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,193,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $21,357,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, $569,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,075,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,260,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $1,461,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,711,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $1,066,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

Offut Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,505,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $2,222,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $672,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $3,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $715,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $77,405,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,249,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,352,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Supply facilities, and utilities, $374,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $8,590,000.

UNITED STATES SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $443,541,000.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including

land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and com-

munity facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified locations, 343 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 300 units.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 350 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 300 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 470 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 285 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 260 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 320 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 550 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 300 units.

Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 260 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 400 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000".

(b) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85-685, is amended, under

the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place perma-

nent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $86,505,000; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $83,330,000; section 103, $5,000,000; or a total of $199,045,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $113,253,000; outside the United States, $42,265,000; section 202, $21,765,000; section 203, $5,000,000; or a total of $182,283,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $295,100,000; outside the United States, $65,081,000; sec-

tion 302, $443,541,000; section 303, $5,000,000; or a total of $808,722,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its

Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another Department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended;

(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 507

of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES

(Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson, South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326).

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units

involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 410. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 411. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of

special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 412. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78) is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000."

SEC. 413. Titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.

Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.

Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.

Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.

Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.

Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.

Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.

Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.

Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.

Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.

Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.

East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.

El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.

Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.

Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.

Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities: $168,000.

Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.

Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.

Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.

Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.

Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.

New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.

Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.

Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.

Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.

Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.

San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.

San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.

San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.

Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.

Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.

Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.

Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.

Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.

Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.

Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.

Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.

Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.

Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.

Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.

Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.

Colville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

Dermott, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.

Dover, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.

Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.

Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.

Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Heber Springs, Arkansas: Training facilities, $90,000.

Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.

Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.

Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.

Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.

Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.

Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.

Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.

Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.

Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.

Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Riverdale, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.

Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.

Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.

San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.

Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.

Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.

Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.

Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.

Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.

Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities and operational facilities, $364,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and troop housing, $188,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Utilities and ground improvements, $4,963,000.

Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $426,000.

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee:

Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $192,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any

facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided,* That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 3 of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."

"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."

"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000;" and by striking out in clause (2) (b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place

thereof "$12,446,000;" and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,702,000".

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army Reserve, $20,748,000;

(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,451,000;

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States $15,536,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1) (a), (1) (b), (2), (3) (a), and (3) (b) of section 504, respectively.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959."

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the

United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site for a United States Army Reserve Center: *Provided,* That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer

and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.

SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts except that any moneys received under section 1 (2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5674

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

MARCH 13, 1959
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 18, 1959
For actions of March 17, 1959
86th-1st, No. 43

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....25
Alaska.....33
Appropriations.....9,17
Area redevelopment.....16
ASC committees.....32
Civil defense.....5
Crop insurance.....26
Debt management.....1
Electrification.....7,28
Farm loans.....21
Farm prices.....9
Farm program.....9,30
Flood prevention.....31
Foreign aid.....14
Foreign trade.....12
Housing loans.....11
Lands.....31
Military construction....6
Military training.....20
Milk.....2
Minerals.....34
Personnel.....22
Price supports.....9
Prices.....9,18
Public debt.....1,10
Public Law 480.....6
REA.....28
Research.....27
Soil bank.....4
Statehood.....19
Surplus commodities.....33
Unemployment.....11
Water compact.....23
Water pollution.....3,13
Water resources....8,15,29
Watersheds.....31
Wildlife.....24

HIGHLIGHTS: Rep. Poage criticized Secretary's farm policies. House committee ordered reported bill to increase expenditure authorization for special milk program. Rep. Cooley introduced bills to: Increase crop insurance premiums to cover administrative costs; Provide revolving fund for certain FHA loans; Extend automatic preservation of acreage allotment histories. Rep. Denton introduced and discussed bill to exempt REA from 1953 reorganization plan. Rep. Curtis, Mo., introduced and discussed bill to expand research and development in forestry.

HOUSE

1. DEBT MANAGEMENT. Rep. Reuss criticized present debt management policies as leading to higher interest costs on the debt and not resulting in refinancing the debt with nonbank, long-term savers and urged that the objective must be to restore the confidence of investors in Government securities. pp. 3921-8

2. MILK. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 5247, to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for fiscal year 1959 under the special milk program. p. D173

   Rep. Johnson, Wis., criticized the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association for calling Wisconsin milk "tired old milk" and local rules which keep out "high-quality milk that family type Midwestern farmers" could deliver for less "than the local monopoly charges." pp. 3928-9

3. WATER POLLUTION. Rep. Dingell stated that the Columbia River was polluted and that steps must be taken to end this threat to human health. p. 3929

4. SOIL BANK. Received from this Department a report on the 1958 soil bank conservation reserve program. p. 3930

5. CIVIL DEFENSE. Received the Annual Report of the Federal Civil Defense Administration for fiscal year 1958. p. 3930

6. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Armed Services Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 5674, to authorize certain construction at military installations including authorization to use foreign currencies under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing. p. D173

7. ELECTRIFICATION. The Public Works Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 3460, TVA self-financing bill. p. D174

SENATE

8. WATER RESOURCES. The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved S. Res. 48, expressing the sense of the Senate that a committee should be established to study the development and coordination of water resources. p. D171

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

9. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Poage criticizing the Secretary's farm policies, stating that these "policies have resulted in cost far and away beyond anything ever experienced under the much higher rigid supports of previous administrations. The Public is just now beginning to recognize that flexible supports, which were advanced to save money for the taxpayer and to reduce our surpluses have failed to do either," and inserting several tables on realized net income of farmers, appropriations for this Department, CCC price support losses, and farm prices and income. pp. A2286-8

Rep. Huddleston inserted an editorial, "The Law Is the Law Is Nuts," criticizing penalties assessed against farmers for overplanting acreage allotments. p. A2271

10. PUBLIC DEBT. Rep. Wright inserted several articles commending his proposal for a systematic plan for paying off the national debt. pp. A2266-7, A2267-8, A2270-1, A2274-4

11. UNEMPLOYMENT; HOUSING LOANS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bailey discussing and inserting a letter from Rep. Teague on the unemployment situation in W. Va. which has resulted in the inability of many veterans to meet their payments on housing loans. p. A2267

12. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Lipscomb inserted an article, "East-West Trade Fight Lurks in Berlin Crisis -- Commerce May Be Secret Weapon of Khrushchev at Summit Conference." pp. A2276-7

13. WATER POLLUTION. Rep. Dingell inserted two articles discussing the problem of water pollution control. pp. A2277-8, A2304-5

14. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Fulton inserted an article, "Maintaining Security, supporting the President's mutual security proposals, and urging greater emphasis on economic aid for foreign countries. pp. A2295-6

15. WATER RESOURCES. Rep. Brooks inserted his address as president to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress discussing "problems affecting the water development program," and his recommendations for water resource development. pp. A2302-3

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 19, 1959
For actions of March 18, 1959
86th-1st, No. 44

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.8,46,51
Acreage history.....51
Appropriations.....25
Area redevelopment.9,24,33
ASC committees.....42
Banking and currency....52
Budget.....37
Civil defense.....16
Conservation.....18
Cooperatives.....23
Cotton.....8,32,46
Credit unions.....48
Economic conditions.....12
Electrification....1,19,30
Expenditures.....11
Farm income.....26
Farm loans.....15
Farm program.....31
Flood control.....19,36
Food bank.....22
Food storage.....22,28
Foreign aid.....13,35,41
Foreign trade.....47
Forestry.....4,18,29
Government corporations.....17,49
Guam.....20
Hall of fame.....40
Holidays.....38
Inflation.....3
Insecticides.....43
Lands.....18,37
Legislative program.....24
Military construction....5
Milk.....2
Monopolies.....10
Natural resources.....18
Oranges.....53
Patents.....44
Personnel.....38
Postal rates.....6
Price controls.....45
Prices.....3
Public Law 480.....5
REA.....30
Research.....20,43
Soil bank.....14
Special milk.....2
Statehood.....54
Textiles.....34
Transportation.....50
TVA.....19
Vehicles.....38
Water.....7
Water resources.....21
Watersheds.....36
Wildlife.....43
Wool.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported bill to authorize rental of cotton acreage allotments. Senate committee reported area redevelopment bill. Rep. Roosevelt urged approval of legislation to expand special milk program. House committee ordered reported bill to give REA independent status. Rep. Reuss introduced and discussed bill to transfer Public Law 480 functions to State Dept. Sen. Fulbright introduced and discussed administration's mutual security bill.

HOUSE

1. ELECTRIFICATION. The Government Operations Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 1321, to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 regarding REA. p. D180

2. SCHOOL MILK. Rep. Roosevelt urged the House to approve additional funds for the special milk program. p. 4062

3. PRICES; INFLATION. Rep. Patman criticized the Federal Reserve System for instituting a tight money policy during a period of "administered prices," stating that tight money decreases classical inflation but is "not effective in checking price increases of this kind," and inserted several articles on the subject. p. 4077-9

4. FORESTS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 2497, to add certain lands located in Idaho to the Boise and Payette National Forests. p. D180

5. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment, H. R. 5674, to authorize certain construction at military installations including authorization to use foreign currencies under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing (H. Rept. 223). p. 4080

6. POSTAL RATES. The Postal Operations Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported to the full committee with amendment H. R. 4595, to clarify and make uniform certain provisions of law relating to special postage rates for educational, cultural, and library materials. p. D181

7. WATER. Received from the Colorado Legislature a memorial urging the preservation and safeguarding of established state and individual rights regarding the use of water within the separate States. p. 4082

SENATE

8. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported an original bill, S. 1455, to authorize the rental of cotton acreage allotments (S. Rept. 115). p. 3943

9. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendments S. 722, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically depressed areas (S. Rept. 110). p. 3943

10. MONOPOLIES. Passed as reported S. 726, to amend the Clayton Act so as to provide for more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders. pp. 4004-06

11. EXPENDITURES. Sen. Langer inserted a bulletin, "The Growth of Social Welfare Expenditures Under Federal Programs." pp. 3996-8

12. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS. Sen. Gore and others discussed "the serious economic problems with which our country is faced," including comments on interest rates on REA loans and the farm income situation. pp. 3980-91

13. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Mansfield stated that Congress should "take a very careful look" at the President's proposed mutual security program. pp. 4025-6

14. SOIL BANK. Received from this Department a report on the 1958 soil bank conservation reserve program. p. 3935

Received a local Farmers Union resolution urging that the actual production per acre over the last 10 years be used as a basis for county records to determine allotments and conservation reserve payments. p. 3942

15. FARM LOANS. Received from the Farm Credit Administration two proposed bills to: "Amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks" and "clarify the status of the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the banks for cooperatives and their officers and employees with respect to certain laws applicable generally to the United States and its officers and employees"; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. p. 3935

86TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 223

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS AND RESERVE COMPONENTS

MARCH 18, 1959.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5674]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 2, line 11, strike "Savannah" and insert in lieu thereof "Savanna".

Page 24, line 10, strike "$225,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$255,000".

Page 32, line 12, strike "Offut" and insert in lieu thereof "Offutt".

Page 40, following line 6, insert a new item as follows:

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.

Page 69, line 6, strike "section 1" and insert in lieu thereof "section 601".

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENTS

All of the foregoing amendments, with the exception of that relating to the addition of Capehart housing at Moody Air Force Base, merely correct typographical errors.

The amendment relating to Moody Air Force Base provides an authorization for 200 units of Capehart housing at this installation. Family housing under the Capehart program had been planned for this installation but were never constructed. At the present time, there are only eight on-base public quarters at Moody and it is the view of the committee that a small increment of the family housing needed for this base should be granted at this time.

34006—59——1

Purpose of the Bill

The purpose of this bill is to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States, and (in title V) authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components.

Total Authorizations Requested

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Title I (Army):	
Inside continental United States	$86, 505, 000
Outside continental United States	24, 210, 000
Classified	83, 330, 000
Emergency construction	5, 000, 000
Total	199, 045, 000
Title II (Navy):	
Inside continental United States	113, 253, 000
Outside continental United States	42, 265, 000
Classified	21, 765, 000
Emergency construction	5, 000, 000
Total	182, 283, 000
Title III (Air Force):	
Inside continental United States	295, 100, 000
Outside continental United States	65, 081, 000
Classified	443, 541, 000
Emergency construction	5, 000, 000
Total	808, 722, 000
Subtotal	1, 190, 050, 000
Deficiency authorizations:	
Title I (Army)	1, 186, 000
Title II (Navy)	640, 000
Title III (Air Force)	2, 343, 000
Total	4, 169, 000
Title V (Reserve components):	
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves	8, 300, 000
Air Force Reserve	4, 093, 000
Air National Guard	15, 536, 000
Army Reserve	20, 748, 000
Army National Guard	8, 451, 000
Total	57, 128, 000
Deficiency authorizations:	
Air National Guard	470, 000
Army Reserve	90, 000
Total	560, 000
Grand total of all authorities granted by titles I, II, III, and V	1, 251, 907, 000

Deficiency Authorizations

In titles I, II, and III of the bill are found items which amend prior public laws so as to increase the authorizations for projects, the

initiation of which was authorized in past years. These amendments are to defray deficiencies in authorizations previously granted and are necessary because of the general rise in construction costs throughout the world.

In this connection, the committee is pleased to note that the deficiency authorizations this year total only $4,379,000. Two years ago, the deficiency authorizations totaled $183 million and last year, totaled $43 million. It is clear from the foregoing that the departments have heeded the urging of the committee to present to the Congress a construction bill based on firm, realistic figures. The committee feels that the military departments are to be congratulated in having embarked upon a course of better planning and better cost estimating.

Reserve Components

All of the details relating to the construction for Reserve components contained in this bill appear later in the report. The committee felt that the report should be divided in this fashion since the types of construction items for the Reserve components and the considerations dictating the requirements for such are for the most part unrelated to the regular military construction program.

Summary of Military Construction Authorizations

In order that the House may review the status of all military construction authorization through fiscal year 1948 to date, the following summary is provided (all figures represent $1 million):

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Total authorizations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1959	4,744	4,107	13,215	22,066
Less unfunded authorizations repealed and rescinded through fiscal year 1958	−674	−356	−1,307	−2,337
Less estimated unfunded authorization to be repealed by sec. 507 of Public Law 85-685	−142	−182	−943	−1,267
Less appropriations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1959	−3,588	−3,307	−10,402	−17,297
Less dollar equivalent of counterpart fund pesetas utilized through fiscal year 1959	0	−50	−72	−122
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1959	340	212	491	1,043
Additional new authorization proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	+231	+195	+873	+1,299
Increases in prior year's authorization proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	+1	+1	+2	+4
Total of fiscal year 1959 residual and proposed fiscal year 1960 authorizations	572	408	1,366	2,346
Less unfunded authorizations to be repealed by sec. 103(b), 203(b), 303(b), and 406 of fiscal year 1960 bill	−100	−86	−227	−413
Less proposed fiscal year 1960 appropriation	−341	−244	−894	−1,479
Less counterpart fund pesetas proposed for utilization in fiscal year 1960	0	−10	0	−10
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1960	131	68	245	444

Residual authorization

The foregoing tabulation illustrates that the amount of residual authorization available to the three military departments is being steadily reduced each fiscal year. This means that each year the lowest priority projects are eliminated through the annual rescission of unfunded authorization, as provided under section 406 of this bill. Consequently, the balance of residual authorization left available con-

sists of both urgently needed projects, and other projects for which the requirement has changed due to revisions in missions and weapons.

The military departments are each using part of their annual construction appropriations to assure continued progress on the most urgent of these residual projects. The remainder of their annual appropriation is applied to essential new project authorizations. It is necessary that a proper balance and control be maintained between these two segments of the program so that construction can satisfactorily proceed on both residual and new authorization at a rate which which is in proper relationship to the entire military construction program.

Limitations on new authorizations

In order to achieve this, the amount of new authorization granted this year has been closely limited and consists mainly of additional increments on projects already underway, items required to support new weapons developments, and essential modernization of our bases.

Title I—Army

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Title I (Army):	
Inside continental United States	$86, 505, 000
Outside continental United States	24, 210, 000
Classified	83, 330, 000
Sec. 103 (locations not specified)	5, 000, 000
Total	199, 045, 000

The Army would be authorized $199,045,000 in this bill exclusive of the authorities contained in sections 104 and 105. The new authorization granted herein is approximately $110,421,000 less than that authorized for the fiscal year 1959.

A general résumé of major components included in the new authorization total follows:

Guided missiles

The sum of $123.1 million, or 61.5 percent of the total request is directly related to the area of guided missiles. Construction for missiles falls into three groups: The surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missile programs for defense of our key bases and our metropolitan and industrial centers in the United States and our key military installations overseas $53.6 million, including logistic support facilities; research, development and test facilities for missiles $51.5 million; expansion and modernization of facilities at specialized schools for the training of personnel in the operation and maintenance of surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missiles for a total of $18 million.

Oversea areas

The sum of $35.6 million or 17.8 percent of the total request for construction requirements in oversea base-rights areas (exclusive of surface-to-air missiles). This authorization will fulfill an urgent and high priority requirement for operational and logistic-type facilities in support of U.S. Army Forces deployed in Europe and the Far East, in accordance with mutual defense agreements, as well as the Signal Corps and Army Security Agency's worldwide missions.

Troop housing

The sum of $6.2 million or 3.1 percent for troop housing in the continental United States and oversea areas, including $0.2 million for permanent barracks to accommodate 56 enlisted women, and $1.2 million for permanent BOQ spaces to accommodate 130 officers. The remaining $4.8 million will provide 2,109 semipermanent barracks spaces and 34 BOQ spaces at temporary installations in the continental United States and in oversea areas.

Army aviation

The sum of $7.7 million, or 3.8 percent for construction in support of Army aviation at major installations throughout the United States and in oversea areas.

Medical facilities

The sum of $8 million, or 4 percent for the construction of hospital and medical facilities, to include $4.4 million for one permanent-type hospital.

Categories of construction

A breakdown of the program by broad categories is as follows:

Program by categories

[In thousands]

Category	Continental United States	Overseas	Total
1. Operational and training facilities	$13,485	$6,772	$20,257
2. Maintenance and production facilities	5,542	1,302	6,844
3. Research and development and test facilities	4,150		4,150
4. Supply facilities	3,101	3,991	7,092
5. Hospital and medical facilities	8,039	4	8,043
6. Administrative facilities	297	340	637
7. Housing and community facilities	14,368	7,543	21,911
8. Utilities and ground improvements	8,497	4,168	12,665
9. Real estate		90	90
Total	57,479	24,210	81,689
Classified	29,026	83,330	112,356
Sec. 103, locations unknown			5,000
Grand total	86,505	107,540	199,045

PROGRAM BY MAJOR ACTIVITIES

A description of the program by major activities and the missions to be served follow:

Technical services

Ordnance Corps.—The assigned mission of the Ordnance Corps, under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, is to support Army combat forces by the provision of all weapons, ammunition, combat vehicles, ordnance general supplies, and train personnel to furnish specialized ordnance services of the types needed, when and where needed. This element of the program totals $7,786,000 for construction at four installations, to include operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, supply facilities, and utilities, representing 3.9 percent of the program.

Quartermaster Corps.—The Quartermaster General, under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, develops, provides and services food, clothing, petroleum (except field and higher echelon maintenance of pipelines), aerial supply equipment, other quartermaster equipment, supplies, maintenance and services for the Army, and, as assigned, for the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; provides for the disposal of Army surplus personal property, as assigned; and provides for the care and disposition of the remains and personal effects of deceased personnel of the Army and as directed or agreed upon, of the Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, and for general supervision of the operation of national cemeteries. Included in the program for the Quartermaster Corps is $414,000 for construction at one installation to include operational and training facilities, and troop housing, representing approximately 0.2 percent of the program.

Chemical Corps.—The mission of the Army Chemical Corps, under the direction and control of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, is to provide support to the Department of Defense (Army, Air Force, and Navy including the Marine Corps) in the fields of chemical biological, and radiological (CBR) warfare, including smoke, flame, and incendiaries, and materiel and equipment. This mission carries with it a responsibility to assure that the Army achieves a realistic capability for operations in both offensive and defensive CBR warfare. This segment of the program totals $802,000 for the construction of research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities and utilities at two installations, representing 0.4 percent of the program.

Signal Corps.—The primary mission of the Signal Corps under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics is to provide communication and pictorial services for the United States Army, worldwide, and for other components of the Department of Defense as directed. The Signal Corps element of the program totals $3,230,000 for construction of operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities at one installation, representing 1.6 percent of the program.

Corps of Engineers.—The Corps of Engineers, a technical service and a combat arm, is the construction agency for the Department of the Army whose Chief reports to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. The Chief of Engineers is the commander of the Corps of Engineers and the senior engineer staff officer of the Department of the Army, and as such is in charge of the entire military-civil works program of the Corps of Engineers. Construction proposed for the Corps of Engineers totals $1,376,000 for construction at one installation to provide operational and training facilities, medical facilities, research, development and test facilities and utilities, representing 0.7 percent of the program.

Transportation Corps.—The Transportation Corps, a technical service under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, provides or secures transportation services for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This element of the program totals $5,117,000 for construction at two installations to provide hospital and medical facilities and family housing representing 2.6 percent of the total program.

Medical Corps.—The Army Medical Service, headed by the Surgeon General who reports to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, furnishes the Army Establishment, and when appropriate, members of other uniformed services, medical and dental care, hospitalization,

evacuation, preventive medicine, veterinary and other services essential to the maintenance of health. This program will provide $188,000 for construction of one Medical Corps installation consisting of medical facilities and utilities representing less than 0.1 percent of the total program.

Continental U.S. armies

First U.S. Army.—The mission of the commanding general, 1st U.S. Army, a continental U.S. Army command, whose area includes the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont is to command the 11 installations and 6 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components which include U.S. Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed; such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within 1st Army area. The program includes $123,000 for construction at two installations in the 1st Army area, to provide operational and training facilities, representing less than 0.1 percent of the program.

Second U.S. Army.—The mission of the commanding general, 2d U.S. Army, a continental U.S. Army command, whose area includes the States of Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia, is to command the 10 installations and 2 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include U.S. Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within 2d Army area. This element of the program contains $5,506,000 for con-

struction at three installations, to provide operational and training facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities and utilities, representing 2.8 percent of the program.

Third U.S. Army.—The mission of the commanding general, 3d U.S. Army, a continental U.S. Army command, whose area includes the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, is to command the nine installations and one subinstallation within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include U.S. Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within 3d Army area. The program includes $7,518,000 in support of 3d U.S. Army at five installations, to provide operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities and utilities, representing 3.8 percent of the program.

Fourth U.S. Army.—The mission of the commanding general, 4th U.S. Army, a continental U.S. Army command, whose area includes the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, is to command the eight installations and two subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include U.S. Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within 4th Army area. There is included in the program $13,437,000 for construction at three installations of operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, representing 6.7 percent of the total program.

Fifth U.S. Army.—The mission of the commanding general, 5th U.S. Army, a continental U.S. Army command, whose area includes the States of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, is to command the 11 installations and 1 subinstallation within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include U.S. Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within 5th Army area. The 5th Army element of the program totals $1,014,000 for construction at three installations, to provide operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities and utilities, representing 0.5 percent of the total program.

Sixth U.S. Army.—The mission of the commanding general, 6th U.S. Army, a continental U.S. Army command, whose area includes the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington, is to command the 10 installations and 10 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include U.S. Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within 6th Army area. The program provides $303,000 at two installations in the 6th Army area, for supply facilities, real estate and utilities, representing less than 0.2 percent of the total program.

Other continental U.S. areas

The Military Academy.—The U.S. Military Academy, West Point, has the mission of instructing and training the Corps of Cadets, so that each graduate shall have the qualities and attributes essential to his progressive and continuing development throughout a lifetime career as an officer of the Regular Army. The Army's program contains $6,303,000 for construction of family housing and utilities at the Academy, representing 3.1 percent of the total program.

Alaskan area.—The Alaska Command provides the ground and antiaircraft defense and logistic support of military bases in Alaska and operates the Army Arctic Test Center. The program includes $2,716,000 for training facilities, family housing and community facilities at 2 locations, or approximately 1.3 percent of the program total.

Tactical installations support facilities.—These facilities provide the family housing required at tactical defense installations in the continental United States. This element of the program totals $1,646,000 at various installations, or 0.8 percent of the program.

Oversea permanent and general areas

Pacific Command area.—The primary missions assigned to the Army in the Pacific are to assist in the ground defense of Korea by providing forces and logistic support thereof, to provide ground forces within the area of responsibility of the commander in chief, Pacific, to train and maintain all elements including Army Reserve components, to utilize resources provided for the conduct of planning required in support of the combined forces in the Pacific, and to provide for and maintain the security and combat readiness of assigned forces. The program for this command totals $1,566,000, or 0.8 percent of the program for construction in Hawaii and Okinawa of operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and real estate.

U.S. Army, Europe.—This element of the program totals $12,451,000 and contains facilities required to support elements of U.S. forces in France, Germany, and Italy. This includes forces stationed on the line of communications, France, the U.S. 7th Army in Germany and the Southern European Task Force in Italy. The construction is for various installations, and will provide operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing, and utilities. It represents 6.2 percent of the program total.

Caribbean Command.—This portion of the program provides $228,000 or approximately 0.1 percent of the program for training facilities at one installation in the Caribbean Command.

Section 102

This section includes $83,330,000 or 42 percent of the program for the establishment and development of classified Army installations, worldwide.

Section 103

This section includes $5 million or 2.5 percent of the program and will permit construction made necessary by changes in missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules when deferral of such

construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be detrimental to the interests of our national security.

Section 104

This section authorizes the following: Construction or acquirement by lease or otherwise of 557 units of family housing for occupancy as public quarters overseas pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and construction of 7,399 units of family housing for occupancy as public quarters at 14 locations, and at various Army Air Defense Command stations in accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended.

Section 105

This section provides amendments to Public Law 85–241 of the 85th Congress, increasing authorizations granted in this law at certain installations. These amendments, for the most part, are necessary to defray deficiencies in authorization granted in fiscal year 1958, brought about basically by the general rise in construction cost indexes throughout the world.

Land acquisition

The committee notes that the Army has continued to make most commendable progress in minimizing requests for the acquisition of new lands. Aside from land required for surface-to-air missile air defense in the continental United States, there is only one land-acquisition project included for a total of 60 acres to be acquired in fee title at a cost of $90,000.

Title II—Navy

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATION

Title II—Navy:	
Inside the United States	$113, 253, 000
Outside the United States	42, 265, 000
Classified	21, 765, 000
Emergency construction	5, 000, 000
Total	182, 283, 000

The Navy would be authorized $182,283,000 in this bill for new military construction, and an increase of $690,000 in authorization granted for several projects in previous years. These amounts are notably smaller than those granted for similar purposes last year, being less by $143,711,000 and $15,135,000, respectively.

The amount approved for new construction has been reduced by $13,001,000 from the figure of $195,284,000 shown in section 402(2) of the bill. This resulted from the following actions by the committee. It decreased the amount recommended by the Navy for emergency construction in section 203 of the bill, from $17,500,000 to $5 million. The committee believes this action is warranted because of the Navy's steadily improving planning and because less than $700,000 of similar authorization has been utilized by the Navy to date during the current fiscal year.

The remaining reduction of $501,000 resulted from committee approval of a Navy recommendation. This was to revise the estimated cost of two shipyard facilities projects and two aviation

facilities projects, based on recently completed engineering studies; and to add an oversea yards and docks facilities project which had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget too late to be included in H.R. 4414. The projects involved in this action are:

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.: Reduce the estimated cost from $1,350,000 to $500,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H.: Increase the estimated cost from $3,417,000 to $3,497,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.: Reduce the estimated cost from $5,576,000 to $5,147,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.: Reduce the estimated cost from $462,000 to $400,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Add the project for improved water system for $760,000.

A long-range policy established by the committee several years ago is again proving its soundness this year. In essence, this policy is to authorize only those firm, fully supported projects which the services plan to include in the corresponding execution programs. There have been few exceptions to this rule. View the Navy's program, several benefits are evident. There is decreasing need for amending prior authorizations to compensate for higher costs. The amount of unused authorization has decreased to a reasonable, manageable size, the Navy estimating that there will be only $67 million available at the beginning of fiscal year 1961. This compares very favorably with the estimated $212 million to be available at the start of fiscal year 1960 and $421 million at the beginning of the current fiscal year. A third apparent benefit is that construction plans will be much more current than heretofore, in keeping with scientific advances and new technologies.

Military construction supports other programs

The military construction program has as its only purpose, the support of other Navy programs. This fact was demonstrated clearly and conclusively throughout the Navy's testimony. The Navy related the need for each of the 198 line items in its program to a specific requirement for support of one or more of four major objectives, all pointed toward improving combat readiness. These four broad objectives are the support of:

(*a*) Fleet operations	$125, 596, 000
(1) Carrier strike force	41, 706, 000
(2) Antisubmarine warfare	8, 804, 000
(3) Continental air defense	23, 133, 000
(4) Training	23, 015, 000
(5) Logistics	28, 938, 000
(*b*) Marine Corps ground and air forces	8, 199, 000
(*c*) Guided missile program	34, 466, 000
(*d*) Research and development	9, 022, 000
Total	177, 283, 000

The $5 million for emergency construction is not included in above the summary since it may be applied for support of one or more of the four objectives.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard

Last year the Congress authorized $6 million for construction of cyclopean dikes and other subsidence remedial measures at this shipyard. This authority, however, was restrictive. It granted the Navy authority to use $500,000 for immediate construction of dikes to protect the shipyard and surrounding municipal and private property from the flooding which would otherwise result from the expected subsidence during the period through fiscal year 1960. The remaining $5.5 million may be used for remedial measures only when the Secretary of the Navy has determined that action to halt the subsidence is effective. This determination has not yet been made. The amount of salt water being injected daily to repressurize the oil field has increased considerably during the past year. It is, however, still appreciably less than geologists and engineers estimates is required. Legal action initiated by the Navy has not yet produced the desired results. However, the committee considers that further protective measures are necessary to prevent inundation of the area during and beyond the remaining period of subsidence. Numbers of experts have estimated that this phenomenon will cease about 1970. Consequently, the committee feels constrained to approve the project for an additional $500,000 to complete the protective dike construction. The committee is firmly convinced that the continued operation of the naval shipyard and the safety of the costly Government investment are threatened unless early and vigorous action is taken by the community to halt the subsidence.

Pacific missile range

The initial phase for development of this range was authorized by the Congress last year for nearly $14 million. This bill would authorize the second step in the construction in the amount of $30,050,000. Additional yearly increments of $30 to $40 million will be required for approximately the next 6 years to complete the facilities development, in accordance with long-range Navy plans. This committee is normally opposed to taking any action which has any implication of a commitment for a future Congress. In this instance, the committee believes each increment will be usable and self-sufficient. Further, it considers that, as national missile programs are approved and assigned, requirements for facilities in support thereof should be met in a timely manner.

The range will be used by all the services, with the Navy being responsible for its administration. Here, training in operation of guided missiles will be conducted; IRBM and ICBM will be developed and tested; instrumented devices will be fired into polar and equatorial orbit. The Point Mugu—former Camp Cooke—location has many features which favor missile-range development. The unlimited seaward firing capability, in regard to both distance and azimuth; the relative accessability of contractors' plants; the availability of landward range capability and impact areas; the existing developmental facilities at Point Mugu and the relatively isolated firing sites at the south portion of former Camp Cooke—now known as Point Arguello—are the outstanding features of the range.

Missile firings will require facilities and instrumentation on a number of Pacific Islands. The bill provides for construction of these facilities and the flexibility to modify the development plans

for these island facilities as may be dictated by the vast distances involved and the rapidly changing art of missilry.

The committee considers this an excellent example of imaginative planning in the field of unconventional weapons.

The committee examined the program and interrogated Navy witnesses in sufficient detail to be assured that it is austere and fully justified. On this basis, and with the amendments to the bill outlined above, the committee approved the Navy program. It consists of the following 11 classes of facilities:

1. Shipyard facilities, $9,755,000

Shipyard facilities are required for protection of existing installations and support of construction, repairs, overhaul, and operations of submarines and surface ships.

This class of facilities is composed of 11 items at 6 continental locations, and 1 line item at 1 oversea location. The major project consists of four line items at the Submarine Base, New London, Conn., to augment the barracks and replace two obsolescent boilers so that greater utilization of existing and planned training facilities may be made by the large number of students required to support the increased nuclear and Polaris submarine programs. Another large project consists of two line items at the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H., to deepen the berths and to improve the building ways to accommodate the larger type modern nuclear submarines which will be berthed and repaired at this activity.

A project at the Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass., consists of two line items to replace the overage caisson for Drydock No. 2 and to improve the dewatering system for Drydocks Nos. 1 and 2. A project of one line item at the Naval Shipyard, New York, N.Y., will improve the dewatering system for Drydocks Nos. 2 and 3 by installing a connecting conduit. A project of one line item for the David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md., will expand the Acoustic Data Analysis Center to improve its support of antisubmarine warfare and nuclear submarine development. A project of one line item at the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif., is for necessary minimum protective measures to prevent inundation of the shipyard as a result of expected future subsidence.

The one oversea project is a line item at the Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands, for major rehabilitation of wharves.

2. Fleet base facilities, $7,353,000

Fleet base facilities include one project to support the operating forces. This is a line item at the Naval Station, Newport, R.I., to construct a breakwater north of the two piers in Coddington Cove. This breakwater will protect the ships berthed at the two piers from damage caused by wind and resultant surging due to wave action.

3. Aviation facilities, $116,729,000

The aviation shore activities are required for training naval aviators, for supporting the operating forces, including the Marine Corps, and for research and development in the aeronautical and missile fields.

Aviation and missile facilities comprise slightly more than 66 percent of the Navy's program dollarwise. The projects in this class include 129 line items at 24 air stations.

The aviation facilities are composed of five groups of air stations. The first group consists of 16 line items at 3 naval air training stations. These items provide an additional increment in the development of the air training station at Meridian, Miss.; for operational facilities and land acquisition at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla.; and for the construction of a chapel at Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.

The second group, the fleet support air stations, consists of 23 line items at 3 stations. Included are an additional increment for the development of the master jet field at Lemoore, Calif.; and medium range radar facilities at Naval Air Stations, Miramar, Calif., and Oceana, Va.

The third group consists of 11 line items at 4 Marine Corps air activities. A majority of the items provide for facilities at the auxiliary air station, Yuma, Ariz.; but also included are barraeks at the air facilitity at Santa Ana, Calif.; and liquid oxygen transfer buildings at the air station, El Toro, Calif., and the auxiliary air station at Beaufort, S.C.

The fourth group of 5 special-purpose air stations includes 55 line items. All but 8 of the line items will provide facilities for the Pacific Missile Range and the Naval Missile Center, Point Mugu, Calif.; the 8 remaining line items will provide an additional increment of construction for the naval air facility, John Towers Field, the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N.J., and Patuxent River, Md., and the Naval Air Material Center at Philadelphia, Pa.

The final aviation facilities group are 24 line items at 9 stations overseas. The projects will provide facilities at two classified locations overseas and at the Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P.R., where the Navy conducts operational training of the fleet with guided missiles; personnel facilities at Naval Station, Argentina, Newfoundland; improvement of the runway at Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan; liquid oxygen facilities at both the air stations at Cubi Point, Philippine Islands, and Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay in Hawaii; and dredging in the harbor at Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain.

4. Supply facilities, $5,132,000

Worldwide supply support to the fleet is a principal mission of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts' shore facilities. Supply centers and depots replenish ships directly and through fleet-issue ships, tenders, and tankers which, in turn, deliver material underway to the fleet wherever operating at sea. Materials are furnished naval installations such as shipyards and bases, air stations, training centers, etc. The procurement, issue, and inventory and financial control of over a million items of repair parts and consumables are accomplished with business machines at the supply control offices and depots.

This group of projects will provide a secure underground storage facility for aviation fuels at the Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, and the alteration of existing building spaces to install electronic data processing machines needed for stock and financial accounting controls at the Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, the Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, N.Y., and the Naval Supply Depots, Bayonne, N.J., and San Diego, Calif.

5. Marine Corps facilities, $1,897,000

The mission and purpose of the Marine Corps shore facilities are to support the Marine Corps combat forces in order that they may be maintained in readiness to engage promptly and effectively in combat operations with continuing maximum efforts devoted to eumulative improvements in readiness at all levels.

The Marine Corps is subject to call on short notiee to deploy its forces, ranging in size from a few men to a division, to any part of the world for guard duty, to quell a disturbanee, or to participate in full-seale war. Consequently, the Marines must be hightly trained in amphibious and other means of warfare, and eompetently led. Constant training is necessary to obtain and retain proficiency. This group of projects consists of seven line items at three eontinental Marine Corps activities. Facilities will be provided for storage of ammunition, structures related to atomic weapons, and improvemcnt of utilities systems.

6. Ordnance facilities, $2,682,000

The objectives of the military construction program of this elass of faeilities is to provide and keep modern facilities ashore for effective support of the fleet and the conduct of research, design, development, limited production, test, and evaluation materials, components, assemblies, and systems principally in thc fields of rockets, missiles, and underwater ordnance.

This program eontains four projects. One of these projects is at a continental location, and the other three are classified projects at classified locations. The one unclassified project is to provide facilities for the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technical Center, and independent activity physically located at the Navy propellent plant, Indian Head, Md. This center is a triserviee installation managed and supported by the Navy to develop, for triservice use, techniques, design of tools and instruction pamphlets for disposal of explosive ordnanee material. One of the three elassified projects will provide the various classified facilities at classified locations for support of the Polaris fleet ballistic missile development. The other two classified projects will provide classified antisubmarine warfare support facilities at one continental and one overseas loeation.

7. Service school facilities, $7,499,000

The Bureau of Naval Personnel is responsible for the procurement, distribution, training, education, discharge, promotion, and retirement of Navy personnel and for the processing and maintaining of reeords of Navy personnel.

This group of projects consists of eight line items at six locations, one of which is a classified installation at the Submarine School, New London, Conn. They provide for training and support facilities. Included is a project for mueh-needed replacement and rehabilitation of underground utilities systems at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, as a partial step toward alleviation of the serious maintenanee problem experienced at the Academy. Also included is a project for conversion of facilities at the former Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Corry Field, Fla., for the relocation of thc Naval Communication School, now located at Imperial Beach, Calif., in high maintenance eost temporary struetures. Continuing the policy of replacing recruit training faeilities which are inadequate, expensive to maintain, and hazardous to

health and morale, is a major project at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., to provide the first increment of permanent barracks for the second recruit camp. Included in the project at Great Lakes is a line item for alterations to an electric substation. An additional project is submitted for the purpose of acquiring land at the Naval Station, Norfolk, Va., which is now leased by the Navy and on which the fleet recreation park is located.

8. Medical facilities, $75,000

There is one line item at the Naval Medical Research Laboratory at the Submarine Base, New London, Conn. This item will provide for alterations to an existing building and is the second and final increment of construction to provide permanent facilities for the Naval Medical Research Laboratory. This Laboratory conducts medical research and development on problems peculiar to shipboard, submarine and diving medicine.

9. Communication facilities, $12,863,000

The mission of naval communications is to provide required reliable, secure, rapid communications primarily for control of the operating forces and secondarily to facilitate the administration of the Naval Establishment.

In the group of projects for communication facilities are six continental projects and six oversea projects.

Three of the continental projects are for the improvement of communication equipment. Two are to provide support facilities for the U.S. Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine, and the Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, W. Va. The remaining one is to replace a barracks at the Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine.

The program for communication facilities at oversea activities consists of six projects. One is to provide for humidity and temperature control in the terminal and receiver buildings at the Navy Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey. The second is for a barracks with mess at the Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland. The third is to provide for grounds drainage facilities at the Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Hawaii. The fourth is to provide a radio direction finder facility at the Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa. The fifth is for a standby generator plant at the Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico. The last project will provide a sewage-treatment plant for the radio station, Wahiawa, Hawaii.

10. Office of Naval Research, $1,591,000

Public works sponsored by the Office of Naval Research are for the purpose of providing adequate facilities for conducting scientific research and development in the field of nuclear physics.

The one project in this class is for a high level radiation laboratory at the Naval Research Laboratory in the District of Columbia. It will provide for the study of radiation phenomena below the range of 10,000 curies and permit research into many design problems of authorized and future nuclear-powered ships, submarines and aircraft.

11. Yards and Docks facilities, $11,707,000

The Bureau of Yards and Docks is responsible for fulfilling the Navy's requirements in the broad field of civil engineering at all shore

activities. This includes the technical responsibility for the design, planning, development, procurement, construction, alteration and maintenance of public works, public utilities, construction and base transportation facilities throughout the naval shore establishment.

This group of two line items will provide (a) an improved electric power system, alleviating a predicted critical islandwide power shortage on Guam and (b) an additional, emergent fresh water facility for the Atlantic Fleet's Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The committee also approved six amendments to prior authorization of public works. After considering the elements making up current construction costs, the requested increases in authorization appear warranted. The amount approved totals $690,000. This is $160,000 less than appears in H.R. 4414, since the Navy, with approval by the committee, withdrew a proposed amendment.

Family housing

The objective of the family housing program is to provide housing at isolated stations where no community support exists or where necessary because the availability of community housing is small in proportion to the military requirement.

One project would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct 100 units of family housing at the Naval Station, Bermuda, utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Projects at 17 stations within the continental United States would provide a total of 4,322 family housing units to be funded in accordance with provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendment of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended. Development of these projects will be contingent upon extension of the provisions of that title. The projects are: Naval Ammunition Depot, S.C., 40 units; Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., 500 units; Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nev., 106 units; Naval Air Station, Glynco, Ga., 225 units; Naval Station, Key West, Fla., 500 units; Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., 500 units; Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla., 40 units; Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss., 320 units; Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, La., 178 units; Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., 500 units; Naval Station, Newport, R.I., 500 units; Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Fla., 42 units; Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va., 250 units; Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, W. Va., 142 units; Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, Calif., 150 units; Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla., 229 units; Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz., 100 units.

Construction of the Capehart housing indicated in the previous paragraph will require the acquisition of the following Wherry projects:

	Units
Newport, R.I	356
Key West, Fla	1,000
Quantico, Va	450
Whiting Field, Milton, Fla	96
China Lake, Calif	600
Twentynine Palms, Calif	493
Total	2,995

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Inside continental United States (sec. 301)	$295, 100, 000
Outside continental United States (sec. 301)	65, 081, 000
Missiles (sec. 302)	443, 541, 000
Unforeseen construction (sec. 303)	5, 000, 000
Total new authorization	808, 722, 000
Increased authorization for prior years' projects (secs. 305 and 306)	2, 343, 000
Total amount of Air Force authorizations	811, 065, 000

The Air Force would be authorized $808,722,000 in this bill to provide for the construction of new facilities at 149 major installations, of which 101 are inside the United States and 48 are outside the United States. The bill also provides facilities at a number of installations and sites, including operational sites for strategic, defense, tactical, and ballistic missiles, off-base navigational aids, aircraft control and warning system sites, and facilities at classified locations. In addition, the bill provides an increase of $2,343,000 in authorization in prior years' laws to cover the increased costs of certain approved projects. The fiscal year 1960 military construction program of the Air Force includes the minimum facilities to provide an operational capability to the forces planned at the end of fiscal year 1962.

A breakout of the Air Force authorization request is contained in the following table:

Command	Authorization amount (thousands)	Percent of total
Inside the United States:		
Air Defense Command	$21, 279	2.6
Alaskan Air Command	20, 881	2.6
Air Materiel Command	20, 938	2.6
Air Research and Development Command	12, 670	1.6
Air Training Command	15, 946	2.0
Air University	2, 306	.3
Headquarters Command	21, 357	2.6
Military Air Transport Service	2, 908	.4
Strategic Air Command	85, 197	10.5
Tactical Air Command	14, 213	1.8
Aircraft control and warning system	77, 405	9.5
Total, inside the United States	295, 100	36.5
Outside the United States:		
Military Air Transport Service	2, 249	.3
Pacific Air Forces	23, 563	2.9
Strategic Air Command	8, 679	1.1
United States Air Forces in Europe	8, 590	1.1
U.S. Security Service	4, 908	.6
Special facilities	105	0
Aircraft control and warning system	16, 987	2.1
Total, outside the United States	65, 081	8.1
Sec. 302: Ballistic, strategic, defense missiles, and BMEWS	443, 541	54.8
Sec. 303: Unforeseen construction	5, 000	.6
Total new authorization	808, 722	100.0

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

The mission of this command is to provide for the air defense of the continental United States. This program contains a request for $21,279,000 and provides operating facilities at 15 locations.

Included within the total of $21,279,000 is an amount of $4,490,000 to provide facilities in support of Strategic Air Command heavy bomber and/or tanker squadrons at seven locations. The remainder of the Air Defense Command program, totaling $16,789,000 provides facilities required to support the basic mission.

Facilities in support of the Air Defense Command are also included in the Air Research and Development Command amounting to $426,000; the Air Training Command for $1,963,000; the Military Air Transport Service for $853,000; the Strategic Air Command for $2,592,000; and the Tactical Air Command for $120,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Alaskan Air Command is to organize and conduct the air defense of Alaska and to provide early warning to the United States and Canada. This command supports the Strategic Air Command, Military Air Transport Services, COMALSEAFRON, the U.S. Army, and the northwest route to the Orient. This program contains a request for $20,881,000 for the Alaskan Air Command and provides facilities at 5 bases totaling $4,371,000 and facilities at 10 various locations totaling $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

The mission of the Air Materiel Command is to (1) provide adequate and efficient systems of procurement, production, maintenance, and supply for the U.S. Air Force; (2) provide general overall logistical support for all activities and agencies for the U.S. Air Force; (3) train specialized units for accomplishment of specified logistics functions in oversea areas and theaters; and (4) train individuals requiring a long training leadtime to fill requirements of air depot type units scheduled for activation and to fill replacement requirements. This program contains a request for $20,938,000 for Air Materiel Command and provides facilities at eight locations.

Included within the Air Materiel Command total program are facilities for the AMC depot supply and maintenance requirements totaling $3,728,000. The SAC mission at three AMC locations requires a total of $588,000. The ADC mission at Griffiss requires a total of $574,000. The Air Technical Intelligence Center at Wright-Patterson requires a total of $1,466,000. A new MATS mission at Kelly requires a total of $123,000 and there are research and development requirements at one AMC installation totaling $10,943,000. The remainder of the program, $3,516,000, is composed of items to satisfy the basic Air Materiel mission requirements.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

The mission of the Air Research and Development Command is to attain and maintain qualitative superiority by the following procedures: (1) Conduct or supervise scientific and technical studies required for the accomplishment of Air Force missions; (2) seek new basic knowledge from which improved aeronautical equipment, material, weapons, and techniques can be developed; (3) undertake the development and recommend the adoption of appropriate new and

improved devices and systems for the conduct and support of air warfare, including aircraft, missiles, weapons, techniques, and procedures applicable to Air Force purposes; (4) perform employment and suitability testing of aircraft, guided missiles, navigational aids, components, and material. This program contains a request for $12,670,000 for the Air Research and Development Command and provides facilities at 11 locations (includes 4 auxiliary sites).

Included within the Air Research and Development Command total program are facilities for research, development, and testing, totaling $9,404,000; air defense missile training at one base totaling $426,000; and a SAC facility at one location totaling $39,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to support the basic ARDC mission requirement.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The mission of the Air Training Command is to provide flying training leading to an aeronautical rating; air crew training; basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty; basic military training; mobile training; and such other training as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF. This program contains a request for $15,946,000 for Air Training Command and provides facilities at nine locations.

Included in the above total is $11,189,000 which provides facilities for the basic Air Training Command mission. Facilities are also included to accommodate SAC missions totaling $2,794,000, and an Air Defense Command mission for $1,963,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY COMMAND

The mission of the Air University Command is to prepare officers for command of large Air Force units, wings, groups, and squadrons, and for staff duties appropriate to those command positions and to provide education to meet the scientific requirements of the Air Force. This program contains a request for $2,306,000 and provides facilities at two locations.

Included within the Air University Command total program is one facility for the Air Defense Command SAGE mission at one location totaling $281,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic Air University mission.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

The mission of the Headquarters Command is to provide proficiency flying, training, housekeeping, and support of U.S. Air Force personnel in the Washington area. Specifically, this command provides administrative and logistic support for the USAF Headquarters Squadron, for those Air Force units stationed within the Washington area where inherent organizational structure does not permit other support, and such other missions as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF. This program contains a request for $21,357,000 for Headquarters Command and provides facilities at one location, primarily to allow the moving of combat readiness training (CRT) and special air mission (SAM) activities from Bolling Air Force Base to Andrews Air Force Base.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE (Z1)

The mission of the Military Air Transport Service is to provide: (1) Airlift required in support of joint war plans; (2) scheduled airlift for the Department of Defense within the continental United States, between the continental United States and oversea areas, and between and within oversea areas as directed by higher authority; (3) world-wide air transport, air weather, airways, and air communications and air rescue service systems; (4) flight service within the Zone of Interior; (5) organization and training of air resupply and communications services; (6) supervision, control, and maintenance of primary facilities required for performing its assigned mission; and (7) theater jurisdiction in oversea areas where MATS units are stationed but which are outside the jurisdiction of any theater commander. This program contains a request for $2,908,000 for Military Air Transport Service and provides facilities at four locations.

Included within the Military Air Transport Service total program are facilities for air defense missions costing $853,000 at two bases and facilities for SAC tanker missions at two bases, costing $284,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic MATS operational requirements.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Strategic Air Command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and prepare a force capable of conducting strategic air operations in compliance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, U.S. Air Force. This program contains a request for $85,197,000 for the Strategic Air Command to provide facilities at 42 locations.

An amount of $18,211,000 is included at four medium bomber bases to provide facilities required for conversion from medium to heavy bomber capability. An amount of $8,614,000 is requested to provide additional facilities at 13 heavy bomber dispersal bases previously programed in support of the heavy bomber weapons system. Of the $30,573,000 contained in the program for medium bomber base facilities, $21,533,000 will be applied to construction at Richard Bong. An amount of $5,752,000 provides for support of medium refueling aircraft at Clinton County Air Force Base and heavy tankers at Offutt Air Force Base. A combat operations center at March Air Force Base is requested for $5,651,000. Facilities for Air Defense Command units on 10 Strategic Air Command bases accounts for $5,001,000 of this request, and $1,007,000 is included for Military Air Transport facilities at Turner Air Force Base. Nontechnical facilities for missile units at two bases amount to $1,619,000. The remainder of the Strategic Air Command program, $8,769,000, will provide for items required to support the basic mission throughout the entire command.

In addition to the $85,197,000 programed at SAC bases, facilities to support the Strategic Air Command are included within other major Zone of Interior commands as follows:

Air Defense Command	$4, 490, 000
Air Materiel Command	588, 000
Air Research and Development	39, 000
Air Training Command	2, 794, 000
Military Air Transport Service	284, 000
Tactical Air Command	779, 000

The authorization for the Strategic Air Command which is included within other commands amounts to a total of $8,974,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Tactical Air Command is (1) to organize, equip, train, and administer the forces assigned or attached to participate in tactical air operations, including light and tactical bombardment, day fighter, fighter bomber, tactical missiles, troop carrier, reconnaissance and support; (2) to maintain liaison with the Continental Army Command; (3) to determine the amount of Tactical Air Command resources to allocate for the training of Air Force and Army personnel and units in air-ground operations; and (4) to maintain a capability and develop plans for the deployment of mobile atomic strike forces for use in tactical air operations in any area of the world independent of, or in concert with, other land, air, naval, or amphibious forces. This program contains a request for $14,213,000 for Tactical Air Command and provides facilities at 10 locations.

Included within the Tactical Air Command total program are facilities for operational and base support items totaling $12,118,000 and Air Defense Command missions at three bases costing $2,095,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

The fiscal year 1960 MCP provides facilities for the improvement of the air defense control and warning system in the United States.

Facilities are provided to house and support new and improved electronic equipment to increase the capability and effectiveness of the system. A large portion of the fiscal year 1960 air control and warning construction program is directed toward providing facilities for major improvements to the SAGE system. A new high capacity computer called the Solid State computer (utilizing transistors rather than vacuum tubes) has been developed. The most effective utilization of this Solid State computer will be obtained by installing it in hardened facilities. Also provided in this program are operations building additions and communications buildings at radar sites which will enable the sites to support the SAGE system; additional gap filler radar stations; new operations buildings, plus necessary land and utilities.

Facilities are also provided to improve the living conditions of the personnel (and their families) who man the air control and warning sites and SAGE centers. These facilities consist of family housing, troop housing and messing, religious and medical facilities and utilities. General base support type projects such as storage and shops are also provided as well as logical facilities to support DEW line operation in Alaska.

This section includes a total of $77,405,000 and consists of the following main elements of the program: $57,300,000 is included for constructing hardened SAGE supercombat centers which will house the Solid State (transitorized) computers. Utilities and necessary real estate are included.

Operations buildings and transmitter/receiver buildings at various existing air control and warning sites to integrate the present facilities with SAGE operations amount to $8,992,000 of the program.

Included in the program is $2,348,000 for new operations buildings and related facilities at five existing air control and warning sites, and $1,635,000 to provide facilities at two air control and warning sites to improve offshore communications with seaward defense elements.

The program will provide $2,280,000 for 19 unmanned gap filler sites to furnish radar coverage at low altitudes.

It also provides $2,295,000 for 27 units of family housing at each of 5 air control and warning sites located in areas where adequate community housing is not available for lease.

The balance of the program will provide $2,555,000 for utilities and support facilities at various air control and warning sites and SAGE centers, and for logistical support of the DEW line.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE (OVERSEAS)

The mission of the Military Air Transport Service is to provide aircraft required in support of approved joint war plans; scheduled airlifts for the Department of Defense between and within overseas areas; worldwide air transport, air weather; airways and air communications; air rescue service systems, and organization and training of Air Resupply and Communications Service and all elements thereof. This program contains a request for $2,249,000 for the Military Air Transport Service and provides facilities at three locations to satisfy the basic mission requirements.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

The mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct tactical air operations, the air defense of Japan, Ryukyus, Marianas, Korea, Wake Island, and the U.S. installations in the Philippines; provide air transportation for combat troops, other personnel and supplies in the Pacific and Far East areas. This program contains a request for $23,563,000 for the Pacific Air Forces and provides facilities at 1 base and 15 various locations.

The Pacific Air Forces program includes hardening of facilities for a classified operational mission at one location totaling $4,100,000; $738,000 in support of Air Force Security Service at one location; $3,120,000 in support of overseas Military Air Transport Service at two locations. The remainder of the program totaling $15,605,000 is composed of items to meet the basic Pacific Air Forces mission requirements.

Included in the Strategic Air Command (Overseas) program are facilities for $106,000 at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, in support of fighter interceptor aircraft at this base.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The mission of this command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and maintain a force capable of conducting strategic air operations in accordance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, U.S. Air Force. This program contains a request for $8,679,000 for the Strategic Air Command and provides facilities at 2 Air Force bases and 12 various locations located in Canada, Great Britain, Greenland, Guam, Newfoundland, Puerto Rico, and Spain.

Included within Strategic Air Command program are facilities for support of tenant fighter interceptor aircraft totaling $873,000, broken down as follows: $106,000, Pacific Air Forces, and $767,000, Air Defense Command overseas. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic SAC mission requirements.

U.S. AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The mission of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe is to support the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; U.S. Commander in Chief, Europe, and the other component commanders under USCINCEUR in their assigned missions; to fulfill responsibilities assigned the Joint Chiefs of Staff in areas not included in either the NATO or USCINCEUR's area of responsibility, and to support commanders operating directly under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program contains a request for $8,590,000 for U.S. Air Forces in Europe and provides facilities at 16 locations.

Included in the program are facilities to support fighter interceptor and tactical fighter aircraft at eight locations totaling $4,598,000; navigational aids at three locations totaling $121,000; fighter rotational mission at one location totaling $788,000; communications network at various locations totaling $2,620,000; and medical facilities at two locations totaling $56,000. Also included are 903 family housing units and community facilities at six locations. The remainder of the program totaling $407,000 is composed of items to satisfy the basic USAFE mission requirement.

U.S. AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

The mission of the U.S. Air Force Security Service (USAFSS) is to provide the communications-electronics intelligence for the U.S. Air Force. In addition, this command is organized to perform communications security services which include the storage, distribution, accounting, and maintenance of cryptographic material.

The fiscal year 1960 program provides facilities, amounting to $4,908,000, for the improvement of the basic U.S. Air Force Security Service mission at seven locations in the European and Mideast areas. Facilities to support the USAFSS requirements, amounting to $738,000, in the Pacific Air Force area and $1,598,000 in the Alaskan Air Command area are included in the respective command portion of this program.

Facilities are provided to house and support new and improved electronic equipment which is required to increase the capability and effectiveness of the intelligence mission. These facilities include operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities.

SPECIAL FACILITIES (OVERSEAS)

This section covers special facilities at an oversea location totaling $105,000.

The requirement for this facility is dictated by the progress of technical developments pertinent to the accomplishment of the mission. This facility is required to replace a World War II prefabricated building that cannot be economically rehabilitated.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM (OVERSEAS)

Facilities in the amount of $16,987,000 are provided for improvement of the A.C. & W. system in Canada to move the air defense combat zone northward. The major part of the fiscal year 1960 A.C. & W. program in Canada is for electric power projects which will replace small wornout electric generators and also provide the additional power and electric distribution system to support the demands of new improved electronic equipment. Also included in the program are operations building additions to house improved electronic equipment; a recreational facility; utility projects; a project for reimbursing the Canadian Government for work accomplished at the five American-financed, Canadian-manned Pinetree sites and facilities required for logistical support of the DEW line.

RATIO OF CONSTRUCTION IN OVERSEA AREAS

Of the $65 million shown for outside the United States, $4 million are in U.S. Territories and possessions, and over $22 million are for projects on the North American Continent which directly contribute to continental defense. This leaves only $39 million, or less than 5 percent of the total program, for projects in foreign countries outside North America.

Category distribution of Air Force fiscal year 1960 military construction authorization follows:

	Total (thousands)	Percent of total
Operational and training	$614,848	76.0
Maintenance	55,477	6.9
Research, development, and test	21,693	2.7
Supply	12,934	1.6
Hospital and medical	17,105	2.1
Administrative	3,055	0.4
Housing and community	32,926	4.1
Utilities and ground improvements	44,835	5.5
Real estate	849	0.1
Unforeseen construction	5,000	0.6
Total	808,722	100.0

BALLISTIC, STRATEGIC, DEFENSE MISSILES, AND BMEWS

The $443.541 million for establishing or developing military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection is to be applied as follows:

Ballistic missiles ($374.085 million).—This provides authorization for construction of new operational Atlas facilities and support facilities for previously programed Atlas sites. It also includes authorization for the construction of hardened facilities for Titan ICBM sites. In addition, it provides for construction of test facilities for the ICBM at Edwards Air Force Base and Patrick Air Force Base. The fiscal year 1960 construction continues the program for provision of ballistic missile facilities which was begun by earlier construction programs.

Strategic missiles ($10 million).—This provides authorization for construction of facilities for strategic missiles, other than the ballistic type and provides a second increment of facilities for the Hounddog

and the Quail air-to-surface missiles carried by the Stratetic Air Command B–52 bombers to provide them with greater penetration capability.

BOMARC ($26 million).—This amount is required to provide additional BOMARC sites in the United States in support of the air defense weapons system. These sites constitute an augmentation to the previously programed sites.

BMEWS ($33.456 million).—This amount for the ballistic missiles early warning system (BMEWS) is required to provide the second increment of technical and support facilities to implement the ballistic missile early warning system. It will provide warnings of ICBM attacks in time to alert Norad and SAC forces.

UNFORESEEN CONSTRUCTION

Authorization of $5 million is requested in this bill for construction of unforeseen projects, without identification to specific construction items or locations. This authorization will provide the Secretary of the Air Force authority to construct urgently required facilities for which requirements are not now known or firm but which must be initiated prior to the next Military Construction Authorization Act.

Changing international conditions and operational concepts, changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, improved production schedules, and new or unforeseen research and development requirements often create new and additional facility requirements on which construction must be initiated promptly and provided in short periods of time in order that the weapons and systems may be effectively utilized at the earliest possible dates or by specified requirement dates.

Unused balances of this type of emergency authority available under Public Law 85–685 will expire as of the date of enactment of this bill. Similarly, any unused balance under the emergency authorization requested in this bill will expire on September 30, 1960.

FAMILY HOUSING

The Air Force family housing program in this bill constitutes a continuing effort to provide adequate housing for Air Force personnel. The constantly changing needs for housing stem from operational changes based on the growth of new weapons systems and upon the increase in number and size of Air Force families.

The housing program authorized under title VIII of the National Housing Act has for the past several years been the main source of providing this important personnel facility. As of February 25, 1959, there have been 52,700 units of title VIII housing approved by the Congress at 110 bases. Of this amount, 19 projects for 11,300 units have been completed and occupied; 67 additional projects for 30,700 units are currently under construction; acceptable bids have been received on 8 projects for 2,700 units; and the balance of 16 projects for approximately 8,000 units are in various stages of design or out for bid. In this bill is a request for the construction authorization of 27 projects for 8,755 units for the title VIII program which will augment prior programs.

Outside the United States the surplus commodity housing program provides most Air Force housing. Under this program, 2,000 units

have been constructed and occupied. An additional 2,000 units are currently under construction in France, Morocco, Spain, and the United Kingdom. In this authorization bill, 2,047 units under this program are requested for the United Kingdom, France, and 3 classified locations.

Where the title VIII and surplus commodity programs are not feasible, a limited amount of housing is programed by means of appropriated funds. Included in this authorization bill is a request for the construction of 135 units at 5 aircraft control and warning sites in the United States where there is very little or no local community rental housing available for rent by military personnel.

The housing program outlined here continues the Air Force policy of programing yearly increments of housing to meet the most urgent needs at specified and carefully reviewed locations by the most efficient and economical means.

REAL ESTATE

The Air Force seeks authorization in this program to acquire various identified interests in 1,736 acres of land, all inside the United States, at a cost of $849,000. These interests are required primarily for the installation of runway overruns and approach lights, navaids and communications facilities, and to establish clearances for flight safety in runway approach zones. In addition, certain real estate interests, not yet firmly identified will be acquired under the authorizations requested in section 302 for the missile programs, and for the SAGE super combat centers and the NORAD combat operations center. The following table summarizes the identified land items in the program.

Land interests in Air Force fiscal year 1960 military construction authorization:

	Acres	Cost
Fee purchase	1,138	$598,000
Clearance easement	565	178,000
Right-of-way easement	33	73,000
Total	1,736	849,000

FORMULATION OF THE PROGRAM

There are set out above what the committee considers all of the basic facts and figures of the Army, Navy, and Air Force construction programs for fiscal year 1960. Bare statistics, however, tell only what the program is. For the kind of understanding which the committee feels it is obligated to convey to the House, it is necessary also to know the how and the why.

Review procedure

Every construction program presented to the Congress by the Department of Defense is, in the first instance, based on requirements. There are differences of opinion as to what the requirements are, and it is these differences of opinion and approach that make the program when presented to the Congress the combined thinking of the best military and civilian minds within the Department of Defense.

First step

The first step in the formulation of a military construction program is to obtain from the field offices of the military departments the needs of the individual military establishments within the geographical or other jurisdiction of each of the field offices. These requests are considered, in most instances, by the next echelon, or echelons, of field officers prior to their submission to the department concerned.

Second step

The next step is consideration within the Department itself. Here again the program goes through several processes of review, until final approval of the Secretary of the military department. Each of the Secretaries then submits his recommendations to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations). The Assistant Secretary's Office is a relatively small one, but staffed with experts in military construction and in fields allied to it. As the committee has stated in previous years, in this office, with a singleness of purpose that has been most encouraging to the committee, all of the programs are reviewed, coordinated, and assembled into a single program reflecting the overall construction needs of all of the military departments.

Original program

The effect of these reviews is dramatically and succinctly apparent when one realizes that the program originally presented by the field offices to the military departments in Washington totaled in excess of $4 billion. This, in turn, was cut by the military departments in Washington to a total of $2,130,604,000. The review by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations cut this latter figure to $1,368,554,000, and the review made by the Bureau of the Budget resulted in a bill of only $1,299,297,000. The committee after its close and detailed scrutiny of the bill cut another $109,247,000 from the measure so that the bill being presented to the House represents a total of $1,190,050,000.

All of the foregoing figures have reference only to new construction in titles I, II, and III of the bill. That portion of the bill relating to the Reserve components is dealt with specifically and separately later in this report.

Personal equation

As the committee has stated on a number of previous occasions, the value of any construction program is in direct ratio to the amount of planning, thought, and review that is put into it. These factors, in turn, are dependent for their worth upon the individuals with the responsibility for formulating and reviewing the program. The committee is convinced that there has been great improvement over the past few years in all of these aspects of the formulation of the military construction programs. The Department of Defense and its military departments have, in the opinion of the committee, engendered a confidence in this respect that is now deserved.

Witnesses

Witnesses from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and from each of the military departments, were questioned most closely with respect to the foregoing matters, and the committee received an assurance, which by the end of the hearings it accepted completely, that every item in the bill as presented had received the closest

scrutiny and consideration during every step toward its final submission to the Congress.

NEW BASES

There are no new bases, in the true sense of the term, authorized by this bill. There are several aircraft control and warning installations throughout the United States for which authority is provided in the bill. There are also some other installations which contemplate new and different activities but which are located immediately adjacent or close to existing bases and will receive their support from these existing bases.

REAL ESTATE

The real property under military control includes property owned, leased, used by permit, easement, and various occupancy rights (foreign base agreements). As of June 30, 1958, the military departments controlled approximately 32.5 million acres of land throughout the world. This land, together with the improvements, had an original cost to the United States of $26.9 billion.

The real estate under military control may be grouped as follows: 26.8 million acres in the United States, together with improvements thereon, having an original cost of $20.7 billion; 3.4 million acres in the Territories and possessions, together with the improvements thereon, having an original cost of $2.9 billion; and 2.3 million acres in foreign countries together with the improvements thereon having an original cost of $3.3 billion.

The real property acreage under military control in the United States consists of the following:

	Acres
Fee owned	7,014,760
Public domain	16,673,234
Temporary use	1,151,147
Leased	1,871,640
Easements	85,628
Total	26,796,409

The above total of 26.8 million acres reflects the decrease of 2 percent of about 550,000 acres less than reported for the period ending June 30, 1957.

Public domain

Attention is invited to the fact that over half of the land under military control is public domain land that has never been on the tax rolls. Only 7,014,001 acres of land under military control have been removed from the tax rolls in the United States.

Percentage of land area of United States

The 26.8 million acres under military control in the United States is approximately 1.4 percent of the total land area in the United States. The U.S. Government owns 408.2 million acres of land in the United States or approximately 21.5 percent of the total land area in the United States.

Disposal

The Department of Defense, the committee was pleased to hear, is continuing its efforts to dispose of the maximum practicable amount

of real property, and during the first cycle of the program from August 27, 1955, to March 1, 1959, a total of 531 installations, or portions thereof, consisting of 1,921,311 acres of land, representing an acquisition cost of $1,005,839,000 were determined to be excess within the meaning of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. Altogether, the property so determined, and that which currently is being examined within the Department of Defense consists of 6,063,000 acres of land on 699 separate installations, which represent an acquisition cost of $1,673,857,842. Eighteen installations were transferred to other military departments as a result of the screening.

REAL ESTATE CURRENT CONSIDERATIONS

The real property management program of the Department of Defense is based, the committee is convinced, on firm military installation requirements in accordance with long-range military planning and with the size, composition, and deployment of authorized force levels. These requirements in turn are determined by the following considerations: (1) Warning of enemy attack; (2) retaliation in event of enemy attack; (3) defense to deter enemy attack and to protect retaliation forces; and (4) the capability to cope effectively with limited wars and prevent the outbreak of general wars.

Full consideration is given to the effect of new weapons systems and advance strategic and logistic methods upon such requirements. All items for land acquisitions and facilities expansion were evaluated within the framework described above in addition to the justification of the project itself.

The committee concedes that the job of tailoring our installation complex to achieve the most effective support under rapidly changing conditions is not an easy one. A majority of our installations were constructed during World War II. Some of them were acquired during World War I and a few prior to that time. A number of installations have become obsolescent or represent capacity which is beyond that which is needed now for assigned missions. Whenever it is economical and feasible such installations are converted for effective utilization to support new missions provided for by long-range plans. A certain number, however, which do not lend themselves to conversion and for which a continuing requirement no longer exists, must be closed.

Pool of installations

In this connection, a pool of installations not in active use has been assembled by States in which they are located. Action has been taken to supplement this pool with a listing of all out-granted land and vacant or unprogramed building space in major categories of permanent and semipermanent buildings located on active installations. This complete assemblage will be screened by the military departments in preparing, and by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (P. & I.) in reviewing all subsequent MCA submissions to assure that existing facilities are utilized to the maximum extent possible in lieu of land acquisition and new construction. Actually, this screening process has been conducted by the Assistant Secretary's office since 1955 through the use of the inactive and excess categories of the "Inventory of Military Real Property," but the committee

feels that the additional means described herein should result in even a more precise and thorough process in the future.

Continuing studies

In addition, each military department is required to conduct studies of each installation under its control on a continuing basis to determine the extent to which each installation is essential in whole or in part in the light of long-range planning. The studies also reveal where consolidations can be made to reduce operating and maintenance costs, and indicate land areas and buildings which can be made available to other military departments. Instructions for making the studies were revised in August 1958 so that requirements and capabilities are coordinated on a current basis within the long-range military planning referred to above. The studies are reviewed in the Assistant Secretary's office to assure that no opportunity is overlooked to make full use of existing facilities and to close and dispose of excess installations which cannot be converted to other use.

Examples of results

Following are some examples of the results obtained under these procedures: Existing installations will be used as support facilities for all new missile projects in this year's program; through transfer of Parks Air Force Base to the Army the latter Department was enabled to excess Camp Stoneman which not only required heavy maintenance costs, but was located on extremely valuable real estate; Navy use of Vincent Air Force Base eliminates the necessity of constructing, by increments, what would ultimately have become a new Naval Air Station at Mojave; Campbell Air Force Base, Ky., is being transferred to the Army, reducing the Army's requirement for airfield and supporting facilities at Fort Campbell; the Naval Industrial Reserve Aircraft Plant, Bronx, N.Y., is being utilized by the Army in lieu of constructing a new 1,400-man Reserve armory; land at Fort Custer, Mich., is bing transferred by the Army to the Air Force to provide a site for Capehart housing; the Naval Industrial Reserve Plant, Mineola, N.Y., is being utilized by the Navy in lieu of constructing new facilities for the Naval Training Devices Center; portions of Twin Cities Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn., and the Elwood Ordnance Plant at Joliet, Ill., are bing converted from conventional ammunition manufacturing and loading to the production of warheads for missiles.

Closing installations and acquiring new lands

Although each inactive installation is screened thoroughly as to suitability for new activities, the committee realizes a certain number do not lend themselves to economic and efficient conversion and must be closed or excessed. In addition, changing requirements and new weapons systems generate a need for the acquisition of additional real estate for operations even though existing installations are utilized for support activities. During fiscal year 1960 the lengthening of existing runways and the construction of missile launching sites will be the principal reasons for new land acquisition.

A summary of the real estate acquisitions proposed in titles I, II, and III of the bill is shown in the following tabulation:

	Fee acquisition (acres)	Fee cost	Easement acquisition (acres)	Easement cost	Total cost
Army	60.00	$90,000	0	0	$90,000
Navy	1,864.31	1,085,000	704	$62,000	1,147,000
Air Force [1]	1,138.00	598,000	598	251,000	849,000
Total	3,062.31	1,773,000	1,302	313,000	2,086,000

[1] Land and dollars, in addition to that shown above, will be required for SAGE and missile construction at various locations where the exact acreage and cost have not yet been established.

FAMILY HOUSING

Great strides have been made in the past 3 years in meeting the family housing deficit, especially in the United States, Territories, and possessions. Under the Capehart program, for example, 70,046 units have been placed under construction through February 2, 1959, and 18,646 of these are completed and occupied. It is estimated that by June 30, 1959, the number of Capehart units under construction will have risen to about 90,000 and all of these should be occupied within 2 years.

To a degree, therefore, emphasis has shifted from meeting a known sizable deficit to a more intensive screening of additional requirements. In this connection it might be well to summarize briefly, the basic policy of the Department of Defense for the provision of family housing:

1. Consideration will be given to meeting the housing requirements of military personnel entitled to quarters allowances under permanent legislation, and of essential civilian employees.

2. In programs to meet housing requirements, existing community support will be utilized to the greatest practicable degree. Government-owned or controlled housing will be provided for personnel required to reside on-station by reason of military necessity, and for other personnel for whom it is impracticable to obtain adequate private housing at reasonable rentals and locations.

There are three major factors which have a bearing on formulation of specific housing programs in implementation of this general policy:

1. The importance of adequate family housing for retention of highly skilled career personnel.

2. The possibility of harmful economic effect on adjacent communities (which may have been supplying private housing), brought about by the sudden impact of a sizable volume of military construction.

3. The problems in long-range planning resulting from changes in weapons and uncertainties as to future deployments.

To strike a balance between these frequently conflicting considerations requires the continuing exercise of judgment and caution. The committee is especially interested in being assured that additional housing authorized represents an essential requirement consistent with long-term troop strengths and basic missions.

Magnitude of need

Gross family housing requirements for the currently authorized military strength of 2,520,000 amount to 859,345 for married male officers and upper enlisted grades; bachelors, lower grade enlisted personnel, and personnel in certain categories of assignments are excluded. Including eligible key civilian personnel and military personnel housed by a service other than their own, the requirements total 877,225 units, worldwide. This figure is higher than that reported last year because of the continued rise in the percentage of married personnel, and because the requirements of Navy fleet personnel (135,750 units) have been included.

It will also be noted that existing adequate assets (including fiscal year 1959 authorizations) total 542,936 units as of December 31, 1958. These include various categories of Government-controlled assets totaling 329,029 units, and 213,907 units of adequate private housing. Against the present gross statistical requirement of 334,289 units, programed construction (proposed fiscal year 1960 authorizations plus rehabilitation) totals 25,718 units, leaving a continued gross statistical deficit of 308,571 units. A breakdown of these figures for the continental United States, Territories and possessions, and overseas, is set forth in tab B.

The committee points out that the gross statistical deficit does not represent a programing objective. A large portion of it (about 175,000 units) represents the conservative safety factors discussed below. Some of it represents certain foreign areas where we may never plan construction of family housing, and still more represents community support which may be expected to improve concurrently with our own construction programs. It is recognized that as the approximately 70,000 military families move into the Capehart units now under construction, a corresponding number of units located for the most part in the civilian community will become available for occupancy by either military or civilian tenants. Because of these factors the departments are proceeding to meet their requirements on the basis of modest annual increments.

Determination of requirements

Considerable interest has been shown by the Congress and the public in how requirements are determined, so the committee wants to explain that in calculating the gross requirements for a particular installation, the servicewide marriage factors for officers and upper enlisted grades are applied to the projected long-range strengths, based on the latest available forecasts for the installation and its component activities. (The married percentage factors for these two categories, i.e., officers and upper enlisted grades, currently are: Army, 84 and 21; Navy, 75 and 35; Air Force, 80 and 32). Requirements for key civilian personnel are then added to produce the overall gross requirement.

In determining the size of a proposed project, the gross requirements for the installation are then reduced by all existing and anticipated adequate assets, both Government owned and private. In addition, a safety factor amounting to at least 10 percent (20 percent in foreign countries) of the gross requirement is deducted; this factor is increased for nonisolated areas. As a further precaution against overbuilding in the United States, Territories and possessions, on-post construction

is limited to a maximum of 55 percent of gross requirements (75 percent in isolated areas or where required by military necessity). Field requests for projects are carefully scrutinized during the course of review, in order to insure that priority is given to the more urgently needed projects. Moreover, large projects are normally broken down into two or more increments.

This year's bill

A summary of the family housing authorizations proposed as line items in this year's bill is as follows:

	Number of appropriated fund units in bill	Number of Capehart units in bill	Number of surplus commodity units in bill	Total number of units in bill
Army	338	7,399	557	8,294
Navy	0	4,322	100	4,422
Air Force	135	8,955	2,047	11,137
Total	473	20,676	2,704	23,853

The 461 appropriated fund units consist of 156 units for West Point, 80 units for Army Nike sites, 135 units for Air Force radar sites, 40 in Alaska, and 50 at a classified Army installation overseas where it is infeasible or impossible to build under the Capehart or surplus commodity programs. The 20,676 Capehart units are all in the United States, except for 150 in Puerto Rico. The 2,704 surplus commodity units are divided into 700 for Army and Air Force in France, 100 for Navy in Bermuda, 1,404 for Air Force in England, and 500 for Army and Air Force at classified locations.

The Capehart program.—As of February 2, 1959, a total of 91,092 units have been cleared for development under the section 803 program; 18,646 units are in completed projects, 51,400 are under contract, and the balance are in various stages of development. It will be noted that for projects which have reached the contracting stage, the mortgages average $15,479 a unit, and total $1,084,223,384. Of this sum, $659,993,382 (61 percent) represents private commitments and $424,230,002 (39 percent) commitments of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Last year, on April 1, 1958, Public Law 85–364 provided for an increase in the interest ceiling for Capehart mortgages from 4 to 4½ percent. Immediately thereafter, following consultation with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Federal Housing Administration Commissioner established 4¼ percent as the current rate. Subsequently, private mortgage placements moved rapidly; from April 1958 to January 1959, 90 projects with 31,025 units have been placed under contract, with commitments for private mortgage financing totaling $491,762,000.

U.S. Military Academy family housing

The committee wishes to point out that after comprehensive studies and thorough field investigations, the Army was unable to develop the previously authorized title VIII Capehart family housing project within the monetary limitations of the Capehart Act, at the U.S. Military Academy.

In order to provide adequate family quarters for company grade officers comparable to housing generally provided at other Army

installations, a total cost of $5,588,000 is required. The dense, rocky, and steep terrain, coupled with the high construction costs in this area, as well as unusually high site preparation and utilities cost, causes the normal limitations for the basic house to be exceeded.

Wherry acquisition.—The Office of the Secretary of Defense has taken action to bring increased uniformity into the administration of the Wherry acquisition program by the military departments. Acquisitions have continued, and as of December 31, 1958, had covered over half the program: 53,776 units out of 83,727. These were divided as follows:

Army	14,009
Navy	8,387
Air Force	31,380

In addition to the above, the Army plans to acquire 2,443 units and the Navy 4,152 units prior to the end of fiscal year 1959, for a new total of 60,371.

Foreign programs.—The committee would like to review briefly the programs for construction of family housing in foreign countries. To begin with, a total of 7,120 units were built under the rental guarantee program: 4,838 units in France, 700 units in Morocco, and 1,582 units in Spain, later transferred to the surplus commodity program. The rental guarantee program provides foreign builders with guarantees of 95 percent of a stipulated rent schedule for a specific term of years, as an inducement to build and make available to U.S. military families acceptable housing at acceptable locations. The guaranteed rents averaged from $105 to $121 per month for periods from 5 to 7 years in France, and $110 per month for 10 years in Morocco. Rents are paid by the individual occupants from housing allowances received.

Surplus commodity program

The surplus commodity program, which utilizes the foreign currency proceeds of agricultural commodity sales, has produced (completed or under contract) family housing in the following principal countries: 2,059 units in Great Britain, 2,048 units in Spain, 2,258 units in France, 1,313 units in Japan, and 493 units in Italy. Total costs for these 8,171 units amount to $105.3 million.

Rental of inadequate quarters.—The Military Construction Authorization Act of 1957 (sec. 407, Public Law 84–241, Aug. 20, 1957), authorized the Secretary of Defense to operate inadequate public quarters on a rental basis. Pursuant to a directive issued by the Secretary of Defense (DOD Directive 4165.34, July 31, 1958) and an Executive order (10766, May 1, 1958) the military departments have reviewed all existing public quarters to determine which are inadequate and can be operated as rental housing. Under this plan, the fair market rent is determined in accordance with a Bureau of the Budget circular, this amount is deducted from the serviceman's quarters allowance, and the balance of the allowance is paid to him in cash. All inadequate quarters must be brought up to acceptable standards or they must be demolished, converted to nondwelling use, or otherwise disposed of by July 1, 1961. It should be noted that Wherry housing cannot be designated as inadequate under this authority.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS BY BID

Except under unusual circumstances, all contracts are being awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, and during fiscal year 1958, 96 percent of all work placed under contract was handled in this manner. The committee is pleased to advise that every effort will be made to continue the practice of advertising for bids on the open market. Reports on this important aspect of our contracting activity will continue to be made to the committee semiannually, as outlined by section 405 of this bill, and by similar provisions in previous legislation. Placement of contracts by negotiation will be utilized only where such procurement is in the interest of national defense.

COMMITTEE CHANGES IN THE BILL

H.R. 5674 is, of course, a clean bill. During the consideration of the original bill, H.R. 4414, the committee made some 70 amendments to it. Some of the amendments represented a number of internal changes within the item which was amended. The 70-odd amendments made to the original bill, therefore, represent only those changes which were obvious on the face of the bill at the conclusion of the committee's deliberations.

That the great majority of the changes made by the committee represented the elimination of items not deemed absolutely essential is evidenced by the fact that the committee reduced the bill by over $109 million.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

These follow the pattern established in prior military construction acts, and a description of each is outlined below:

Section 401

This section is general authorizing language which has appeared for several years in military construction bills. It will be noted that the authorities granted may be exercised without regard to certain sections of the Revised Statutes and two sections of title 10, United States Code. The laws which will have no application to the construction authorized by this bill are as follows:

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as found in title 31, United States Code, section 529, provides in part as follows:

> No advance of public money shall be made in any case unless authorized by the appropriation concerned or other law. And in all cases of contracts for the performance of any service, or the delivery of articles of any description for the use of the United States, payment shall not exceed the value of the service rendered, or of the articles delivered previously to such payment.

There are situations in connection with public-works projects where it may be necessary to advance money prior to the actual receipt of the service or the property to be obtained. For example, where utilities such as power, gas, or water lines are required to be installed and it is necessary for a private utility company to extend its lines to the military installation, the military department ofttimes must

pay for the costs of such extension. These payments are eventually recouped by deductions from the periodic payments made for the service to the utility company. However, in the strict sense, such initial payment for installation costs are advance payments for the service rendered.

Section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as found in title 40, United States Code, sections 259 and 267, provides as follows:

> SEC. 259. No money shall be paid nor contracts made for payment for any site for a public building in excess of the amount specifically appropriated therefor.
>
> SEC. 267. No money shall be expended upon any public building until after sketch plans showing the tentative design and arrangement of such building, together with outline description and detailed estimates of the cost thereof, shall have been made by the Administrator of General Services (except when otherwise authorized by law) and said sketch plans and estimates shall have been approved by the head of each executive department who will have officials located in such building; but such approval shall not prevent subsequent changes in the design, arrangement, materials, or methods of construction or cost which may be found necessary or advantageous: *Provided*, That no such changes shall be made involving an expense in excess of the limit of cost fixed or extended by Congress, and all appropriations made for the construction of such building shall be expended within the limit of cost so fixed or extended.

In regard to that part of Revised Statutes 3734 as found in title 40, United States Code, section 259, the committee feels that the key to the analysis of that provision are the words "specifically appropriated therefor." It will be noted that the bill permits a 5-percent (United States) and 10-percent (overseas) variation for projects authorized by the bill in order to provide necessary elasticity. It is entirely possible that this elasticity would be lost were the construction subject to this section of the Revised Statutes.

With respect to the second part of Revised Statutes 3734 found in title 40, United States Code, section 267, regarding the making by the General Services of sketch plans, outline descriptions, and detailed estimates of the cost of any public building, it is not believed that such was intended nor should apply to the varied and multitudinous projects authorized by the military construction authorization acts. Such a requirement would place a great administrative burden on the General Services Administration which could only result in serious delay.

Section 9774(d), title 10, United States Code—

> (d) Except when built by members of the Air Force, no permanent barrack, quarters, building, or other permanent structure may be built unless a detailed estimate of its cost has been submitted to Congress and a specific appropriation has been made therefor. No one may build such a structure without specific authority of Congress if the cost is more than $100,000.

It is pointed out that detailed estimates of cost are not available in many cases until the project has been authorized by Congress and an architect and engineering contract has been let and performed.

It will be noted also that the authority granted by this section may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes. This provision of law provides in pertinent part as follows:

Section 355, Revised Statutes—

> No public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purposes of erecting thereon any armory, arsenal, fort, fortification, navy yard, customhouse, lighthouse, or other public building of any kind whatever, until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title * * *.

It should be clearly understood that the exception from the requirement that title to land be approved by the Attorney General prior to the exercise of the authorities granted in this bill does not mean that the opinion of the Attorney General will not be obtained. It means merely that urgent construction can proceed prior to the rendering of such an opinion by him.

Sections 402 and 403

These sections relate merely to totals in the bill and percentage variations allowable in the cost of projects and repeat similar provisions in prior laws.

Section 404

Section 404 provides that whenever the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, would interfere with the authorizations granted for construction in foreign countries, and the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for auditing contracts for this construction, the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section. The provision of law referred to is as follows:

SECTION 2313(b), TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

> (b) Each contract negotiated under this chapter shall provide that the Comptroller General and his representatives are entitled, until the expiration of 3 years after final payment, to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of the contractor, or any of his subcontractors, that directly pertain to, and involve transactions relating to, the contract or subcontract.

Section 405

This section relates to the awarding of contracts on a competitive basis, and to the requirement that the military department shall report to the Congress with respect to contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis. The law referred to is the Armed Services Procurement Act.

This section was amended by the committee to provide, in effect, that except under unusual conditions, contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States under this act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of

the Army Corps of Engineers or the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Section 406

This section continues in effect the established policy of repealing longstanding military construction authorizations that have not been used by the military departments. As a result, after July 1, 1960, only those authorizations, with certain specified exceptions, which are contained in public laws enacted subsequent to August 31, 1957, would continue to be available. Under this section, unused authorization that has been in effect 3 years will be automatically rescinded.

Section 407

Section 407 would extend through fiscal year 1962, an increase from 5,000 units to 7,500 units, the leasing authority for housing at tactical installations now contained in section 515 of Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended by section 509 of Public Law 85–685. This will permit Nike and other tactical site housing requirements to be met by utilizing existing private housing to the greatest possible extent, thereby reducing the necessity for construction of military quarters.

Section 408

Section 408 corresponds to section 512 of Public Law 85–685, and would amend section 406 of Public Law 85–241 so as to exempt one additional category of family housing—i.e., rental guarantee housing—from the present requirement for inclusion in the annual Military Construction Authorization Act. The reason for this additional exemption is that rental guarantee housing is, in reality, not military construction. Rental guarantee projects are constructed with foreign capital and are maintained and operated by foreign owners. Our interest in them is simply the guarantee of a certain level of rental income for a limited period of time, in order to encourage the foreign investors to construct the housing and to reserve the houses for U.S. personnel. The rental guarantee program is now planned for use only in areas where it is infeasible to build family housing projects with foreign currencies generated by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. Because of the many complexities involved in both programs, it is not possible to anticipate where the latter might fail and the former succeed; but a degree of administrative flexibility is necessary in the development of programs in foreign countries. It should be noted that rental guarantee projects customarily are cleared with the House and Senate Armed Services Committees in advance.

Section 409

This section amends the limitations on net floor areas of military family housing, contained in title 10, United States Code, to provide that not more than 10 percent of the units built for company grade officers may be four bedroom units and may exceed present floor area limitations (1,250 square feet) by 150 square feet. This is necessary because families which are large enough to require four bedrooms also require additional space in the living, dining and cooking areas.

Section 410

This section provides that housing authorized to be built in foreign countries with appropriated funds under Public Law 85–685, or this act, may be built under the surplus commodity program with foreign currencies generated by the sale of surplus commodities.

Section 411

Section 411 corresponds to section 514 of Public Law 85–685, and prescribes the customary cost limitations on certain common and repetitive categories of construction.

Section 412

Section 412 amends Public Law 85–365 so as to increase from $500,000 to $900,000 the authorization for activities which the Armed Forces are providing in support of the Olympic winter games.

Section 413

This section corresponds to section 515 of Public Law 85–685, and is required to differentiate between the Military Construction Act and the Reserve Forces Facilities Act, which is included under title V of this bill.

Title V—Reserve Forces Facilities

Title V of the proposed legislation would provide specific line-item project authorization for fiscal year 1960 for each of the Reserve components: Army Reserve, Army National Guard, Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard. In addition, the proposed legislation provides for the correction of deficiencies in cost estimates for several items authorized by the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958 (title VI of Public Law 85–685) and for the rescission of certain authorizations granted in that same act for locations which since have been deleted from the programs of the respective Reserve components. The authorizations contained in the proposed legislation, and, in fact, the administration of whole broad facilities program for all of the Reserve components, are subject to the provisions of chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, as amended, which consitute the codified version of the permanent provisions of the original National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (Public Law 783, 81st Cong.) which initiated this comprehensive federally supported facilities program for all of the Reserve components and placed responsibility for its direction and control in the Secretary of Defense. The committee is satisfied that the program is being capably administered and that the requested authorizations contained in the proposed legislation represent well justified and carefully screened requirements for the respective components.

The total amount recommended by the committee for Reserve forces construction is $57,128,000 for new projects; correction of deficiencies in estimated costs of projects authorized in the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958 results in a total increase of $560,000, which is more than balanced by the rescission of items totaling $2,022,000, for a net decrease of $1,462,000 in last year's authorization.

The following summary gives a concise view of the status of authorizations which would obtain upon enactment of the proposed legislation:

[In millions of dollars]

	Army		Naval and Marine Corps Reserves	Air Force		Total
	Reserve	National Guard		Reserve	Air National Guard	
Carryover authorization into fiscal year 1959	28.0	16.5	11.5	4.0	0	60.0
Authorization in Public Law 85-685	5.0	23.3	11.9	5.1	12.0	57.3
Less appropriations through fiscal year 1959	−29.0	−21.8	−20.4	−8.5	−9.6	−89.3
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1959	4.0	18.0	3.0	.6	2.4	28.0
New authorization proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	20.7	8.5	8.3	4.1	15.5	57.1
Increases in prior-year authorization proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	.1	0	0	0	.5	.6
Rescission of prior-year authorization proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	0	−0.7	−1.3	0	0	−2.0
Less proposed fiscal year 1960 appropriation	−20.0	−11.0	−9.0	−4.0	−17.0	−61.0
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1960	4.8	14.8	1.0	.7	1.4	21.7

This tabulation indicates that the amount of residual authorization is being held well within reasonable limits, except in the case of the Army National Guard, the reason for which is indicated below.

Army Reserve forces.—The committee is aware that both the Army Reserve and Army National Guard are undergoing a major reorganization in order to aline their troop structures with the revised organizational structure of the Active Army. Extensive studies are being made within the Department of Defense, concurrently as the reorganization plans are progressing, to reassess the overall facilities requirements of these components, and every effort is being exerted to keep the construction programs correlated with the changes in the composition of the components.

For the Army Reserve, new project authorization proposed for fiscal year 1960 totals $20,748,000, and comprises 62 new Army Reserve centers and approximately 75 projects of the nature of additions to present centers.

For the Army National Guard, the proposed fiscal year 1960 new project authorization totals $8,451,000, and 47 new armories, 13 projects for conversion of present armories, and 5 nonarmory projects which are maintenance and supply-administrative facilities.

The major portion of the new authorization proposed for both Army Reserve and Army National Guard consists of projects which originally were contained in the so-called carryover of consultation-type authorization, and were listed in the data furnished to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate in June 1958. At that time it was pointed out that, for reasons of needed flexibility in the Army programs, the lists of projects totaled up to more than the appropriations available, and that only those projects which could be constructed

within the limits of the available funds actually constituted carryover authorization, as subsequently provided in section 604 of Public Law 85–685. This fact is pointed out since, without a clear recollection of the effect of the law relative to the carryover, it might appear that duplication of project authorization is being granted this year. These unfundable residual items of the carryover list generally were of higher priority than were the projects written into the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958 by the Congress, and therefore are proposed for authorization as line items in this year's bill. This also accounts for the substantial amount of residual authorization shown for the Army National Guard in the foregoing tabulation.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserves.—Nearly half of the $8.3 million of new project authorization proposed for these Reserve components is for essential additional facilities at established Naval Air Reserve installations. The remainder is divided almost evenly between the Naval Surface Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve.

Air Force Reserve components.—The relatively small amount of new project authorization proposed for the Air Force Reserve $4,093,000, reflects the substantial fulfillment of the most urgent requirements for this component, and consists of a variety of operational and support facilities at eight locations, four of which are municipal airports and the remainder jointly utilized military airfields.

For the Air National Guard, the proposed new project authorization totals $15,536,000 and consists of high-priority requirements for the operation and support of the Air National Guard aircraft at 20 locations, 3 aircraft control and warning facilities, 2 of which are located in the Territory of Hawaii, and site preparation for one new airfield. Of the 20 flying installations, 16 are at civil airports and 4 at jointly utilized military airfields.

Navy (aviation, surface, Marine Corps)

From its inception through fiscal year 1958, $70.3 million have been obligated in this program. An additional $4 million plus have been obligated this fiscal year with the expectation that $11 million more (a fiscal year total of $15 million) will be obligated by June 30, 1959, making a grand total of about $86 million by that date.

This effort has gone to provide modern aviation operational facilities to accommodate aircraft which in many cases are comparable to those in the fleets, up-to-date training centers in limited numbers and, this year, a few berthing facilities for ships of the Selected Reserve. However, most of the facilities now in use were acquired from World War II surplus installations. As a result, an increasingly large amount of modernization or replacement will be required as time goes on.

The overall program supported by these facilities is composed of three activities:

(*a*) The Naval Reserve aviation program, which also supports Marine Corps Reserve aviation, in fiscal year 1960 will be made up of 18 installations. Five of these are Naval Air Reserve training units situated on Regular air stations and the remainder are Reserve air stations. Minimum replacement of deteriorated buildings, plus modernization of other buildings and operations facilities, will be required in the future.

(*b*) The Naval Reserve surface program consists of 319 training centers and facilities, and 160 electronics facilities and stations.

Modernization or replacement of most of these will ultimately be required. For example, 80 percent of the training centers are temporary wooden, quonset, or Butler-hut construction. In addition, berthing facilities for Selected Reserve ships are needed in some locations.

(c) The Marine Corps Reserve ground program consists of 228 training centers, 159 of which are combined with the Naval Reserve training centers mentioned above. Replacement or modernization of most of these will be required.

PROGRESS OF THE PROGRAM TO DATE

Army Reserve and Army National Guard

Since 1951, the Army has had appropriated to it $251 million, of which $144.5 million represents contributions made, or to be made, to the States for the National Guard armory and nonarmory programs and $106.4 million represents facilities for the Army Reserve.

In the National Guard armory program 916 of the 1,890 armories constructed by the States without Federal assistance represent adequate facilities for continued use, against a total requirement of 2,250 armories as estimated by the Department of the Army; the States and the National Guard Bureau, however, estimate total requirements as 2,780 armories. These estimates remain to be reconciled upon completion of the new troop unit program under the Pentomic division organizational structure, and the revised plan of distribution of these units throughout the States. A total of 1,211 armories have been constructed, are under construction, or are funded within $130 million of the total appropriations heretofore made available for the National Guard. Thus the remaining requirement for National Guard armories will range between 123 and 653 upon completion of the revised troop unit program by the Department of the Army. Approximately $22 million of the total appropriations heretofore made available for the National Guard represent nonarmory facilities (maintenance shops, supply and administrative facilities) which have been constructed, are under construction, or are programed for early initiation.

In the Army Reserve center program 458 of the 1,617 facilities acquired by lease or donation, and now in use, represent facilities adequate for continued use, against an estimated total requirement of 1,800 centers. A total of 445 centers have been constructed, are under construction, or are funded within the $106.4 million appropriations heretofore made available for Army Reserve construction. Thus the remaining requirement for Army Reserve centers is estimated at 897 centers, representing a future authorization and funding requirement of $234 million. The requirement, also, may be subject to revision upon completion of the new troop unit program under the Pentomic division organizational structure, and the revised plan of distribution of these Army Reserve units throughout the States.

Air Force

The established mobilization requirement of the Air Reserve Forces is 39 combat flying wings; 24 of these wings, consisting of 82 combat squadrons of the fighter and tactical reconnaissance types, make up the tactical force of the Air National Guard and there are 15 medium troop carrier wings of 45 tactical squadrons and 5 air rescue squadrons in the Air Force Reserve.

In addition, there are 158 support-type units of the Air Reserve and Air National Guard which have been programed to meet speeifie mobilization requirements in the fields of eommunications, weather, air resupply, air evaeuation, terminal operations, and hospital-type units.

The Air National Guard operates 94 flying bases and 41 nonflying bases. Construetion plans for fiseal year 1960 and future years do not eontemplate establishing any new bases exeept Bethel, Minn., under present programs, missions, and aireraft assignment. Certain eonstruetion is necessary to eomplete some of the newer facilities; to replaee World War II temporary construetion; to expand facilities, partieularly runways, taxiways, and aprons to aceommodate higher performanee aireraft being reeeived; and to eomplete the program of providing engine buildup shops and roeket storage buildings, whieh only reeently beeame a requirement of the program as advaneed model jet aireraft are reeeived. To summarize, the eonversion of a World War II temporary base strueture to a modernized plant eapable of operating Century series jets will, over a period of 15 years, require about $276.5 million of construction of whieh $224.3 million is expeeted to be obligated through fiseal year 1960 leaving a balanee of $52.2 million for future years.

For the Air Foree Reserve, $77.2 million have been funded under the authorization provided through fiscal year 1959. The faeilities provided through the expenditure of these funds has contributed immeasurably to the attainment of the high degree of combat eapability whieh exists in the Reserve troop-carrier units today. Of the 36 flying bases required to support flying units, 35 are now in operation with a good pereentage of the operational faeilities required having been provided. The remaining base required is now under construetion and will be completed during fiseal year 1959. To round out all facilities needed at the flying bases of the Air Foree Reserve will require approximately $26 million after fiseal year 1960.

Title V—Sectional Analysis

Section 501(1–3) provides the Secretary of Defense, subjeet to the general provisions of law governing the eonstruetion of facilities for Reserve components as contained in ehapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, with the authority to establish or develop faeilities for the several Reserve eomponents at the loeations identified in the section in aeeordance with the expenditure limitation alloeated to each project.

Section 501(4) provides the Seeretary of Defense with emergency authority to initiate a new projeet or projeets for eonstruetion or development of Reserve faeilities made neeessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to Reserve Forees units if the Secretary or his designee determines that deferral of such faeilities would be ineonsistent with the interests of national seeurity and providing that the Seeretary or his designee notifies the Senate and House of Representatives of his deeision to proeeed under this emergeney authority together with information as to the nature and estimated cost of sueh projeet. This seetion also waives, in the ease of these emergeney projeets, eertain statutory requirements whieh ordinarily apply in the ease of development of Reserve facilities.

Section 502 amends Public Law 85–685 (the Military Construction Act of 1958) to increase, decrease, delete, or change certain authorizations previously provided for the construction of Reserve facilities.

Section 503 is identical in purpose to section 401 of this bill, which provides a general waiver of the prohibition against advance payments in the case of military construction. This section would, therefore, similarly provide a waiver in respect to these requirements in connection with Reserve facilities.

Section 504 is a general provision which provides that appropriations for the projects authorized in section 501 for the respective Reserve components may not exceed the total of the dollar amounts authorized for all of the individual projects.

Section 505 provides that, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, the cost of individual projects may be increased as much as 15 percent. However, the total cost of all Reserve facilities authorized by the bill cannot exceed the total dollar amounts specified in section 504.

Section 506 provides that title V shall be known as the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959.

Title VI

The Army obtained approximately 4.5 acres of land by transfer from the U.S. Coast Guard, Santa Cruz, Calif., in January 1959. This site, known as Lighthouse Point site, was selected as a site for an approved Army Reserve center. Plans and designs were underway to construct the one-unit (modified), 100-man Army Reserve center at this location at an estimated cost of $164,000. The Army planned to advertise the project in April or May of 1959 as part of the fiscal year 1959 execution program. However, the city officials of Santa Cruz requested the Army not to build on the site as the city had other plans for the use of not only that site but the surrounding area.

Alternate sites were offered by the city for the location of the Army Reserve center. Army representatives inspected alternate sites in Santa Cruz in late January 1959 and determined that an alternate site, known as the airport site, containing approximately 4 acres, appeared to be adequate for the location of the center. The city of Santa Cruz offered to exchange the city-owned airport site for the Government-owned Lighthouse Point site and offered to pay the difference in fair market value. The city also offered to extend water and sewerage facilities to the airport site at no expense to the Government and make available to the Army any fill materials necessary for the preparation of the airport site.

Since there was no statutory authority to exchange the lands between the Army and the city of Santa Cruz, the requisite authority has been inserted as title VI in the bill.

The committee wishes to point out that the interests of the United States are well protected in this exchange of lands in that the city of Santa Cruz must pay to the United States the sum of money which represents, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property to be conveyed by the United States exceeds the fair market value of the land to be received by the United States; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the Reserve center at Lighthouse Point; and (3) the amount by

which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the Reserve center at the new site exceeds the estimated cost for these facilities.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment into law of this proposed legislation will involve the expenditure of $1,251,907,000. Of this amount, $57,688,000 represents Reserve components construction.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

This measure is part of the legislative program of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1960 and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in its original form as is evidenced by letter dated February 10, 1959, from Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy which is set out below and made a part of this report.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 10, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1959, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to its presentation to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation would authorize additional military construction that is urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in prior construction authorizations. The appropriation of money required for construction is provided for in the budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1960.

This legislation consists of titles I, II, and III covering authorization required for the active forces of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; title IV covering general provisions relating to the foregoing titles; and title V covering authorization required for the respective Reserve Components.

For the active forces, this proposal would authorize new construction totaling $1,299,297,000 of which $231,252,000 is for the Department of the Army; $195,284,000 is for the Department of the Navy; and $872,761,000 is for the Department of the Air Force. This proposal would also provide additional monetary authority to correct deficiencies in authorization for projects authorized under previous laws totaling $4,379,000 of which $1,186,000 is for the Army; $850,000 is for the Navy; and $2,343,000 is for the Air Force. Therefore, the total in this proposed legislation of new authorization plus additional monetary authority for projects previously authorized amounts to $1,303,676,000 for the Active Forces.

This proposal would also repeal as of July 1, 1960, all authorizations, with certain exceptions, for military construction for the Active Forces that are contained in laws enacted prior to August 31, 1957. This repeal will continue in effect the policy established in the fiscal year

1956 Military Construction Authorization Act (Public Law 161, 84th Congress) of repealing longstanding authority that has not been exercised by the military departments. It is believed that the continuation of this policy will result in a construction program which will reflect more accurately the current needs of the Department of Defense.

For the Reserve components, the proposal would authorize construction totaling $56,993,000 of which $20,748,000 is for the Army Reserve; $8,316,000 is for the Army National Guard; $8,300,000 is for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves; $4,093,000 is for the Air Force Reserve; and $15,536,000 is for the Air National Guard. It would also provide additional monetary authority to correct deficiencies in authorization for certain projects contained in Public Law 85–685 totaling $560,000 of which $470,000 is for the Air National Guard and $90,000 is for the Army Reserve. Therefore, the total of new authorization plus additional monetary authority for projects previously authorized amounts to $57,553,000 for the Reserve components. This proposed legislation also provides for the rescission of authorization contained in Public Law 85–685 for certain installations which are no longer required.

Accordingly, the total authorization requested in this legislation for both the Active Forces and the Reserve components amounts to $1,361,229,000.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL MCELROY.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, there is herewith printed in parallel columns the text of provisions of existing law which would be repealed or amended by the various provisions of the bill.

EXISTING LAW	THE BILL
The Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636) (Public Law 85–685)	
(Sec. 103:) The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connec-	(Sec. 103(b):) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

EXISTING LAW

tion therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

The Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636)

(Public Law 85–685)

(Sec. 203:)

The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House

THE BILL

(Sec. 203(b):)

Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

EXISTING LAW	THE BILL
of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.	
The Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636) (Public Law 85–685)	
(Sec. 303:) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.	(Sec. 303(b):) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.
The Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636) (Public Law 85–685)	
(Sec. 507:) As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for military public works	(Sec. 406:) As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works

EXISTING LAW

to be aeeomplished by the Secretary of a military department in eonneetion with the establishment or development of military installations and faeilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are eontained in Aets approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, exeept—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Aets in the titles that eontain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projeets as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construetion contraets or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is eontained in seetion 302 of the Aet of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorizations for publie works and the appropriation of funds that are eontained in sections 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U.S.C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communieations, Franee, in the amount of $30,000,000 that is eontained in title I, seetion 102, of the Aet of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(6) the authorization for development of elassified faeilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, seetion 102, of the Aet of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(7) the authorization for pub-

THE BILL

to be aecomplished by the Seeretary of a military department in eonnection with the establishment or development of military installations and faeilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are eontained in Aets approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, exeept—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Aets in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for publie works projeets to whieh appropriated funds have been obligated for eonstruetion eontraets or land aequisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in seetion 302 of the Aet of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communieations, Franee, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is eontained in title I, seetion 102, of the Aet of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified faeilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is eontained in title I, seetion 102, of the Aet of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) the authorization of publie works and for the appropriation of funds that are eontained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended;

(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of seetion 507 of the Act

EXISTING LAW

lic works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

(8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the authorization for:

(a) jet engine test cells in the amount of $1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201 under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

(b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount of $225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in the amount of $590,000 at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; research and development facilities in the amount of $1,804,000 at the Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New Jersey; and navigational aids in the amount of $400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540), as amended;

(c) the development of aviation ordnance facilities in the amount of $2,638,000 that is contained in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

THE BILL

of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support

EXISTING LAW	THE BILL
	Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;
	(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.
Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324, 326) Camp Jackson, South Carolina: Medical facilities, $5,000,000.	(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson, South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326).
The Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636) (Public Law 85–685)	
(Sec. 509:) Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:	(Sec. 407:) Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:
"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and including 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit	"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis

EXISTING LAW	THE BILL
basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."	and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."
The Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636) (Public Law 85–685)	
(Sec. 512:) Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read as follows: "(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appropriations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1018).	(Sec. 408:) Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."
Title 10, United States Code	
(Sec. 4774:) (a) In the construction of family quarters from appropriated funds for members of the Army, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit:	(Sec. 409(a):) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof: "(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for offi-

EXISTING LAW

Grade	*Square feet*
General officer	2,100
Colonel	1,670
Major or lieutenant colonel	1,400
Officer below major	1,250
Enlisted member	1,080

In this section, "net floor area" means the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States; and

(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station, base, or other installation, based on the grade authorized for that position.

(c) The maximum limitations for family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for civilians are the same as those for members of the Army of comparable responsibility, grade, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

(d) Except when built by members of the Army, no permanent barrack, quarters, building, or other permanent structure may be built unless a detailed estimate of its cost has been submitted to Congress and a specific appropriation has been made therefor. No one may build such a structure without specific authority of Congress if the cost is more than $100,000.

(e) A limitation upon the cost of quarters built for members of the Army does not apply to expenditures for work and equipment outside those quarters, including expenditures for—

(1) the furnishing of electricity, gas, water, and sewage disposal;

(2) roads and walks; and

(3) grading and drainage.

THE BILL

cers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

EXISTING LAW

(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.

Title 10, United States Code

(Sec. 7547:)

(a) In the construction of family quarters for members of the naval service, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit:

(1) For flag officers in the Navy and general officers in the Marine Corps—2,100 square feet.

(2) For captains in the Navy and colonels in the Marine Corps—1,670 square feet.

(3) For commanders and lieutenant commanders in the Navy and lieutenant colonels and majors in the Marine Corps—1,400 square feet.

(4) For officers of the naval service below the grade of lieutenant commander or major—1,250 square feet.

(5) For enlisted members of the naval service—1,080 square feet.

In this section "net floor area" means all floor space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States; and

(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station or installation, based on the grade authorized for that position.

(c) The maximum limitations for family quarters for civilians are

THE BILL

(Sec. 409(b):)

Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

EXISTING LAW

the same as those for members of the naval service of comparable responsibility, grade, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

Title 10, United States Code

(Sec. 9774:)

(a) In the construction of family quarters from appropriated funds for members of the Air Force, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area unit:

Grade	*Square feet*
General officer	2,100
Colonel	1,670
Major or lieutenant colonel	1,400
Officer below major	1,250
Enlisted member	1,080

In this section, "net floor area" means the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States; and

(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station, air base, or other installation, based on the grade authorized for that position.

(c) The maximum limitations for family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for civilians are the same as those for members of the Air Force of comparable responsibility, grade, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

(d) Except when built by members of the Air Force, no permanent barrack, quarters, building,

THE BILL

(Sec. 409 (c):)

Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

EXISTING LAW

or other permanent structure may be built unless a detailed estimate of its cost has been submitted to Congress and a specific appropriation has been made therefor. No one may build such a structure without specific authority of Congress if the cost is more than $100,000.

(e) A limitation upon the cost of quarters built for members of the Air Force does not apply to expenditures for work and equipment outside those quarters, including expenditures for—

(1) the furnishing of electricity, gas, water, and sewage disposal;

(2) roads and walks;

(3) grading and drainage; and

(4) the construction of air bases or depots under section 9773 of this title.

(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

THE BILL

In addition to the foregoing, the bill also provides additional monetary authorization to correct deficiencies in authorization for certain projects authorized under previous Military Construction Acts, and in some cases repeals the authorization. There follows a listing by

individual project and public law of the amounts previously authorized and the amounts as changed by the bill:

Public Law	Section	Installation	Existing amount authorized	As amended by bill	Section of bill
85-241	101	Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md	$2,288,000	$2,613,000	105
85-241	101	New Cumberland General Depot, Pa	464,000	597,000	105
85-241	101	Fort Huachuca, Ariz	1,936,000	2,276,000	105
85-241	101	Fort Leonard Wood, Mo	4,663,000	5,051,000	105
534/83d	[1] 202	Classified installations	72,785,000	72,935,000	205
968/84th	201	Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tenn	511,000	664,000	206
968/84th	[2] 201	Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, NC	273,000	330,000	206
85-241	201	Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N.C	39,000	52,000	207
85-241	201	Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif	1,469,000	1,596,000	207
85-241	201	Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey.	130,000	320,000	207
85-241	301	Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska	1,630,000	1,895,000	305
85-685	301	Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.	1,832,000	2,182,000	306
85-685	301	Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr	3,265,000	3,890,000	306
85-685	301	Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis.	15,552,000	16,665,000	306
85-685	603	Naval Air Station, Denver, Colo	652,000	None	502
85-685	603	Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, N.Y	652,000	None	502
85-685	603	Barnes Field, Westfield, Mass	740,000	1,030,000	502
85-685	603	Various locations	300,000	480,000	503
85-685	603	Army Reserve Center, Canton, Ohio	40,000	61,000	502
85-685	603	Army Reserve Center, Greenwood, S.C	85,000	117,000	502
85-685	603	Army Reserve Center, Johnstown, Pa	99,000	136,000	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Bethlehem, Pa.	45,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Carlisle, Pa	45,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Chester, Pa	206,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Clayton, N. Mex.	57,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Hammonton, N.J.	175,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Ligonier, Pa	45,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Northwest St. Paul, Minn.	130,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Pitman, N.J	175,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Princeton, N.J.	175,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Salem, N.J	15,000	None	502

[1] As amended by Public Law 85-241 and 85-685.
[2] As amended by Public Law 85-685.

The above changes in monetary authorization for projects authorized by prior military construction acts require the following changes in the general provisions of such acts as follows:

EXISTING LAW	THE BILL
The Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531) (Public Law 85-241), as amended (Sec. 502:)	(Sec. 105(b):)
There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed—	Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.
(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $116,915,000; outside the United States, $34,477,000; section 102, $143,002,000, or a total of $294,394,000.	

EXISTING LAW	THE BILL
The Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535) (Public Law 534, 83d Congress), as amended	
(Sec. 202:) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by the construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $72,785,000.	(Sec. 205(a):) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000".
The Act of July 27, 1954, (68 Stat. 535) (Public Law 534, 83d Congress), as amended	
(Sec. 502:) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed— (2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, $103,555,000; outside continental United States, $36,493,000; classified installations and facilities, $72,785,000; or a total of $212,833,000;	(Sec. 205(b):) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$72,785,000" and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".
The Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) (Public Law 968, 84th Congress), as amended	
(Sec. 402:) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed— (2) for title II: Inside the United States, $312,004,000; outside the United States, $62,001,000; section 203, $86,711,000; or a total of $460,716,000;	(Sec. 206(b):) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000".

EXISTING LAW	THE BILL
The Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531) (Public Law 85–241) (Sec. 502:) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed— (2) for title II: Inside the United States, $230,356,000; outside the United States, $48,199,000; section 202, $59,056,000; or a total of $337,611,000;	(Sec. 207(c):) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and "$337,941,000".
The Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531) (Public Law 85–241), as amended (Sec. 502:) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed— (3) for title III: Inside the United States, $399,755,000; outside the United States, $160,705,000; section 302, $47,000,000; or a total of $607,460,000.	(Sec. 305(b):) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000", respectively.
The Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636) (Public Law 85–685) (Sec. 502:) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed— (3) for title III: Inside the United States, $542,161,000; outside the United States $123,654,000; section 302, $269,100,000; section 303, $17,500,000; or a total of $952,415,000.	(Sec. 306(b):) Public Law 85–685, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

EXISTING LAW	THE BILL
The Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78) (Public Law 85–365)	
(Sec. 4:) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and not to exceed $3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 2 of this Act.	(Sec. 412:) Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78) is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000".
The Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636) (Public Law 85–685)	
(Sec. 606:) Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 603 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed— (1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $11,886,000. (2) for Department of the Air Force: (a) Air Force Reserve, $5,054,000; (b) Air National Guard of the United States, $11,976,000. (3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve and Army National Guard of the United States, $28,330,000.	(Sec. 502(e):) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000"; and by striking out in clause (2)(b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place thereof "$12,446,000"; and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,352,000".

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

INSIDE UNITED STATES

Alabama	$10,729,000
Army:	
Redstone Arsenal	5,387,000
Fort Rucker	2,662,000
Air Force:	
Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery	1,915,000
Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery	391,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Gadsden	144,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Birmingham	160,000
National Guard Armory, New Brockton	70,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

Alaska	$23,997,000
Army:	
Fort Greely	2,395,000
Fort Richardson	321,000
Navy:	
Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake	84,000
Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak	40,000
Air Force:	
Eielson Air Force Base	1,181,000
Elmendorf Air Force Base	1,150,000
Galena Airport	100,000
King Salmon Airport	1,690,000
Ladd Air Force Base	250,000
Various locations	16,510,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Anchorage	276,000
Arizona	8,311,000
Army: Fort Huachuca	3,230,000
Navy: Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma	3,940,000
Air Force:	
Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson	895,000
Williams Air Force Base, Chandler	246,000
Arkansas	4,473,000
Air Force:	
Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville	1,099,000
Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock	325,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, El Dorado	152,000
Army Reserve Center, Fort Smith	152,000
Army Reserve Center, Harrison	152,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Beebe	45,000
National Guard Armory, Dermott	45,000
National Guard Armory, DeWitt	45,000
National Guard Armory, Hazen	45,000
National Guard Armory, Heber Springs	90,000
Air National Guard: Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock	2,323,000
California	79,247,000
Army:	
Fort Ord	85,000
Presidio of San Francisco	218,000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow	432,000
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro	48,000
Naval Air Station, Lemoore	26,897,000
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach	500,000
Naval Air Station, Miramar	305,000
Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu	30,050,000
Naval Supply Depot, San Diego	100,000
Naval Training Center, San Diego	144,000
Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana	2,216,000
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms	1,137,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

California—Continued	
Air Force:	
Beale Air Force Base, Marysville	$569,000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced	425,000
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc	542,000
George Air Force Base, Victorville	2,222,000
Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael	1,285,000
March Air Force Base, Riverside	6,052,000
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento	1,598,000
McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento	1,548,000
Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard	255,000
Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc	147,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Chico	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Sacramento	61,000
Army Reserve Center, San Diego	526,000
Army Reserve Center, San Barbara	136,000
Army Reserve Center, Vallejo	302,000
Naval Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos	563,000
Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego	226,000
Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael	490,000
Colorado	1,151,000
Army: Fitzsimons Army Hospital	188,000
Air Force: Lowry Air Force Base, Denver	405,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Greeley	132,000
Air National Guard: Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver	426,000
Connecticut	3,608,000
Navy:	
Naval Submarine Base, New London	3,146,000
Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London	75,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Bridgeport-Fairchild	64,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven	323,000
Delaware: Air Force: Dover Air Force Base, Dover	750,000
District of Columbia: Navy: Naval Research Laboratory	1,591,000
Florida	27,155,000
Navy:	
Navy Communication Training Center, Corry Field	1,000,000
Naval Air Station, Pensacola	400,000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field	2,811,000
Air Force:	
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso	833,000
Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead	6,364,000
MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa	866,000
Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa	1,822,000
McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando	8,402,000
Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City	4,266,000
Naval Reserve: Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa	391,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

Georgia	$5,930,000
Army:	
Fort Benning	1,090,000
Fort Stewart	238,000
Air Force:	
Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah	410,000
Robins Air Force Base, Macon	900,000
Turner Air Force Base, Albany	1,505,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Savannah	259,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Gainesville	90,000
National Guard Armory, Savannah	600,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base, Atlanta)	838,000
Idaho	1,466,000
Air Force: Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home	1,361,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Idaho Falls	105,000
Illinois	11,128,000
Army: Savanna Ordnance Depot	1,160,000
Navy: Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	4,712,000
Air Force: Scott Air Force Base, Belleville	253,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Aurora	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Bloomington	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Champaign	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Chicago Heights	302,000
Army Reserve Center, East St. Louis	156,000
Army Reserve Center, Evanston	574,000
Army Reserve Center, Joliet	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Kankakee	168,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves:	
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign	70,000
Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago	518,000
Naval Air Station, Glenview	59,000
Air Force Reserve: O'Hare International Airport, Chicago	1,890,000
Air National Guard: Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria	192,000
Indiana	3,339,000
Air Force: Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru	1,725,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Anderson	136,000
Army Reserve Center, Bloomington	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Hammond	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Muncie	168,000
Air Force Reserve: Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus	364,000
Air National Guard:	
Baer Field, Fort Wayne	238,000
Hulman Field, Terre Haute	238,000
Iowa: Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Washington	160,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

Kansas	$6, 380, 000
Army: Fort Leavenworth	160, 000
Air Force:	
Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka	762, 000
McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita	1, 039, 000
Schilling Air Force Base, Salina	4, 147, 000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Colby	80, 000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, Olathe	192, 000
Kentucky	5, 207, 000
Army:	
Fort Knox	2, 747, 000
Fort Campbell	2, 300, 000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Bardstown	160, 000
Louisiana	4, 052, 000
Air Force:	
Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport	110, 000
Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles	350, 000
England Air Force Base, Alexandria	2, 468, 000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Lafayette	152, 000
Army Reserve Center, New Orleans (No. 1)	520, 000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, New Orleans	178, 000
Air National Guard: Naval Air Station, New Orleans	274, 000
Maine	4, 881, 000
Navy:	
Naval Radio Station, Washington County	3, 179, 000
Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor	271, 000
Air Force:	
Dow Air Force Base, Bangor	1, 260, 000
Loring Air Force Base, Limestone	48, 000
Air National Guard: Dow Air Force Base, Bangor	123, 000
Maryland	30, 167, 000
Army:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground	785, 000
Fort Detrick	270, 000
Fort Meade	2, 530, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Camp Springs	1, 051, 000
Naval Academy, Annapolis	1, 025, 000
David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock	318, 000
Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head	972, 000
Naval Air Station, Patuxent River	1, 196, 000
Air Force: Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs	21, 357, 000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Cumberland	288, 000
Army Reserve Center, Westminster	160, 000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Baltimore	215, 000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

Massachusetts	$5,093,000
Army: Fort Devens	59,000
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Boston	1,422,000
Air Force:	
Laurenee G. Hanscom Field, Bedford	2,258,000
Otis Air Foree Base, Falmouth	1,078,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Leominster	200,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, South Weymouth	76,000
Michigan	10,578,000
Air Force:	
Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Ste. Marie	1,755,000
K. I. Sawyer Munieipal Airport, Marquette	2,779,000
Selfridge Air Foree Base, Mount Clemens	612,000
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoela	2,484,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Ann Arbor	317,000
Army Reserve Center (No. 1)	602,000
Army Reserve Center, Detroit (No. 2)	602,000
Army Reserve Center, Flint	551,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile	771,000
Air National Guard: Alpena County Airport, Alpena	105,000
Minnesota	7,117,000
Air Force: Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth	766,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Duluth	317,000
Army Reserve Center, Mankato	176,000
Army Reserve Center, St. Cloud	330,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, St. Paul	565,000
Air National Guard: Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel	4,963,000
Mississippi	5,627,000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian	5,147,000
Air Force: Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus	264,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Durant	54,000
National Guard Armory, Iuka	54,000
National Guard Armory, Quitman	54,000
National Guard Armory, Webb	54,000
Missouri	6,254,000
Army:	
Fort Leonard Wood	593,000
Army Support Center, St. Louis	261,000
Air Force:	
Riehards-Gerbaur Air Foree Base, Kansas City	866,000
Whiteman Air Foree Base, Knobnoster	2,406,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Fulton	160,000
Army Reserve Center, Jefferson City	288,000
Army Reserve Center, Rolla	160,000
Army Reserve Center, Springfield	73,000
Army Reserve Center, Washington	160,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

Missouri—Continued	
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Farmington	$115,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves:	
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center (ground), St. Louis	370,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center (surface), St. Louis	697,000
Air Force Reserve: Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City	105,000
Montana	4,910,000
Air Force:	
Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow	3,711,000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls	1,066,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Butte	70,000
National Guard Armory, Plentywood	63,000
Nebraska	2,416,000
Air Force:	
Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln	164,000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha	1,802,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Omaha	450,000
Nevada	931,000
Air Force: Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas	672,000
Air National Guard: Hubbard Field, Reno	259,000
New Hampshire	4,039,000
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth	3,497,000
Air Force: Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth	542,000
New Jersey	3,112,000
Army: Fort Dix	64,000
Navy:	
Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne	123,000
Naval Air Station, Lakehurst	726,000
Air Force: McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown	1,083,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Morristown	317,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Cape May Court House	250,000
National Guard Armory, Dover	250,000
Organizational maintenance shop, Jersey City	49,000
National Guard Armory, Riverdale	250,000
New Mexico	3,584,000
Air Force:	
Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis	800,000
Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo	909,000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell	942,000
Sacramento Peak, Alamogordo	616,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Belen	57,000
National Guard Armory, Roswell	200,000
National Guard Armory, Silver City	60,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

New York	$10,945,000
Army: U.S. Military Academy	6,303,000
Navy:	
Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn	365,000
Naval Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn	113,000
Air Force:	
Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome	676,000
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh	1,134,000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton	269,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Bronx	98,000
Army Reserve Center, Glens Falls	176,000
Army Reserve Center, Malone	176,000
Army Reserve Center, Olean	176,000
Army Reserve Center, Oswego	176,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Amsterdam	55,000
National Guard Armory, Buffalo	75,000
Combined Field Maintenance Shop, Camp Drum	308,000
National Guard Armory, Olean	46,000
National Guard Armory, Oswego	52,000
National Guard Armory, Troy	47,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone	104,000
Air National Guard: Hancock Field, Syracuse	596,000
North Carolina	5,021,000
Army: Fort Bragg	1,228,000
Navy: Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune	328,000
Air Force: Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro	3,150,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Benson	105,000
National Guard Armory, Elizabeth City	105,000
National Guard Armory, Mount Olive	105,000
North Dakota	6,683,000
Air Force:	
Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks	2,309,000
Minot Air Force Base, Minot	3,371,000
Army National Guard: Shop hangar, Bismark	57,000
Air National Guard: Hector Field, Fargo	946,000
Ohio	19,183,000
Air Force:	
Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington	4,075,000
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton	12,458,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Akron (No. 2)	574,000
Army Reserve Center, Bellaire	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Dayton	48,000
Army Reserve Center, Delaware	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Marion	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Mount Vernon	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Painesville	168,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Lancaster	160,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland	655,000
Air National Guard: Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield	105,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

Oklahoma	$8,261,000
Army: Fort Sill	5,337,000
Air Force:	
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton	621,000
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City	1,036,000
Vance Air Force Base, Enid	250,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Muskogee	288,000
Army Reserve Center, Okmulgee	160,000
Army Reserve Center, Purcell	160,000
Air Force Reserve: Davis Field, Muskogee	92,000
Air National Guard: Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City	317,000
Oregon	1,764,000
Air Force: Kingsley Air Force Base, Klamath	955,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Salem	61,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Salem	160,000
Air Force Reserve: Portland International Airport, Portland	588,000
Pennsylvania	6,527,000
Army: Letterkenny Ordnance Depot	454,000
Navy: Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia	333,000
Air Force: Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown	2,676,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Allentown-Bethlehem	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Butler	136,000
Army Reserve Center, Gettysburg	168,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Meadville	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Pittsburgh (No. 3)	574,000
Army Reserve Center, Uniontown	220,000
Army Reserve Center, Washington	136,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Johnstown	375,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, Willow Grove	797,000
Air Force Reserve: Willow Naval Grove Air Station, Philadelphia	188,000
Rhode Island	7,353,000
Navy: Naval Station, Newport	7,353,000
South Carolina	2,188,000
Army: Charleston Transportation Corps Depot	251,000
Navy: Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort	51,000
Air Force:	
Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston	822,000
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach	151,000
Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter	715,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Inman	99,000
National Guard Armory, Jonesville	99,000
South Dakota	1,568,000
Air Force: Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City	1,445,000
Air National Guard: Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls	123,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

Tennessee	$11,185,000
Air Force:	
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma	5,690,000
Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna	3,249,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Milan	91,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves: Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City	330,000
Air National Guard: Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis	1,825,000
Texas	28,354,000
Army:	
Fort Bliss	7,260,000
Fort Sam Houston	840,000
Air Force:	
Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo	1,828,000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin	300,000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso	416,000
Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth	1,484,000
Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene	292,000
James Connally Air Force Base, Waco	216,000
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio	1,033,000
Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio	1,307,000
Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman	408,000
Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls	7,741,000
Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring	2,193,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Brownsville	152,000
Army Reserve Center, Dallas	64,000
Army Reserve Center, Galveston	152,000
Army Reserve Center, Odessa	152,000
Army Reserve Center, San Marcos	152,000
Army Reserve Center, San Antonio	520,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Donna	99,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves:	
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont	65,000
Naval Air Station, Dallas	348,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves:	
Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston	204,000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville	35,000
Air Force Reserve: Ellington Air Force Base, Houston	823,000
Utah	873,000
Army: Dugway Proving Ground	532,000
Air Force: Hill Air Force Base, Ogden	341,000
Vermont	435,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Rutland	143,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Enosburg Falls	169,000
Air National Guard: Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington	123,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

Virginia	$9,623,000
Army:	
Fort Belvoir	1,376,000
Fort Lee	414,000
Fort Eustis	4,866,000
A. P. Hill Military Reservation	229,000
Navy:	
Naval Communication Station, Norfolk	1,781,000
Naval Station, Norfolk	81,000
Naval Air Station, Oceana	336,000
Air Force: Langley Air Force Base, Hampton	540,000
Washington	2,470,000
Air Force:	
Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane	158,000
Geiger Air Force Base, Spokane	190,000
Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake	1,036,000
McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma	523,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Wenatchee	168,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Coleville	150,000
Air National Guard: Geiger Field, Spokane	245,000
West Virginia	4,277,000
Navy: Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove	3,957,000
Army National Guard:	
U.S. property and fiscal officer, office and warehouse, Buckhannon	206,000
National Guard Armory, Princeton	60,000
National Guard Armory, Ronceverte	54,000
Wisconsin	23,323,000
Air Force: Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville	21,533,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Beaver Dam	176,000
Army Reserve Center, La Crosse	317,000
Army Reserve Center, Milwaukee (West)	602,000
Army National Guard:	
Organizational maintenance shop, Hayward	52,000
National Guard Armory, Milwaukee	235,000
National Guard Armory, Tomahawk	160,000
Air Force Reserve: General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee	43,000
Air National Guard:	
Camp Williams, Camp Douglas	82,000
Truax Field, Madison	123,000
Wyoming	1,699,000
Air Force: Francis E. Warren, Cheyenne	1,461,000
Air National Guard: Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne	238,000
Various locations (Zone of Interior)	110,749,000
Army: Various	30,672,000
Air Force: Various	77,405,000
Army Reserve: Various	2,588,000
Army National Guard: Various	84,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

Classified (Zone of Interior)	$436, 305, 000
Navy: Various	1, 625, 000
Air Force: Various	434, 680, 000

OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

Bermuda	$295, 000
Navy: Naval Station, Bermuda	295, 000
Canada	4, 133, 000
Navy: Naval Station, Argentia	4, 133, 000
Canal Zone	228, 000
Army: Fort Kobbe	228, 000
Cuba	760, 000
Navy: Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay	760, 000
France	140, 000
Army: Various locations	140, 000
Germany	10, 338, 000
Army: Various locations	10, 338, 000
Hawaii	7, 976, 000
Army:	
Helemano	90, 000
Schofield Barracks	1, 259, 000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu	47, 000
Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu	781, 000
Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu	4, 796, 000
Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu	274, 000
Air National Guard:	
Haleakala aircraft control and warning facility, Maui	446, 000
Kokee aircraft control and warning facility, Kauai	283, 000
Italy	1, 973, 000
Army: Various locations	1, 973, 000
Japan	1, 640, 000
Navy: Naval Air Station, Atsugi	1, 640, 000
Mariana Islands	11, 828, 000
Navy:	
Public Works Center, Guam	10, 947, 000
Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam	507, 000
Air Force: Anderson Air Force Base	374, 000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY REQUESTED OF CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

OUTSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

North Ireland	$267,000
Navy: Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry	267,000
Okinawa	2,255,000
Army: Camp Buckner	217,000
Navy: Naval Security Group activity, Okinawa	2,038,000
Philippine Islands	76,000
Navy: Naval Air Station, Cubi Point	76,000
Puerto Rico	6,367,000
Navy:	
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads	3,579,000
Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca	86,000
Air Force: Ramey Air Force Base	1,309,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Bayamon	150,000
National Guard Armory, Ponce	150,000
National Guard Armory, San German	150,000
Air National Guard: San Juan International Airport, San Juan	943,000
Spain	11,934,000
Navy: Naval Air Station, Rota	11,934,000
Turkey	105,000
Navy: Naval Security Group activity, Karamursel	105,000
Wake Island	2,211,000
Air Force: Wake Island	2,211,000
Various locations (overseas)	71,152,000
Army: Various	9,965,000
Air Force: Various	61,187,000
Classified locations (overseas)	112,331,000
Army: Various	83,330,000
Navy: Various	20,140,000
Air Force: Various	8,861,000
Locations not specified	15,000,000
Army: Various	5,000,000
Navy: Various	5,000,000
Air Force: Various	5,000,000

*NOTE: See Note on page 1.

○

Union Calendar No. 69

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5674

[Report No. 223]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 13, 1959

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MARCH 18, 1959

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,387,000.

~~Savannah~~ *Savanna* Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $3,230,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,866,000.

Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina: Family housing, $251,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,747,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facility, $1,228,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $2,662,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,260,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $593,000.

Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Ord, California: Supply facilities, $85,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.

Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $29,026,000:

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259.000.

Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.

Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $83,330,000.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may estab-

lish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Commit-

tees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.

Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.

Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.

Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.

Fort Ord, California, 500 units.

Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,497,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,897,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,940,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,196,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,050,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real Estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITES

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $11,934,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $781,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $21,765,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved produc-

tion schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 250 units.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000". (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-

tion 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES

(Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and $337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site prepa-

ration, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,078,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, ~~$225,000~~ *$255,000*.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,303,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,458,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $542,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:

Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $2,258,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,598,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,741,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,193,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $21,357,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, $569,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,075,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,260,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $1,461,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,711,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $1,066,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

~~Offut~~ *Offutt* Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,505,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $2,222,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $672,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $3,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $715,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $77,405,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,249,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,352,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Supply facilities, and utilities, $374,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $8,590,000.

UNITED STATES SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $443,541,000.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including

land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and com-

munity facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified locations, 343 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 300 units.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 350 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 300 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 470 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 285 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 260 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 320 units.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 550 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 300 units.

Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 260 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 400 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85–685, is amended, under

the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,-239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place perma-

nent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $86,505,000; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $83,330,000; section 103, $5,000,000; or a total of $199,045,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $113,253,000; outside the United States, $42,265,000; section 202, $21,765,000; section 203, $5,000,000; or a total of $182,283,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $295,100,000; outside the United States, $65,081,000; sec-

tion 302, $443,541,000; section 303, $5,000,000; or a total of $808,722,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its

Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another Department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended;

(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 507

of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES

(Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson, South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326).

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units

involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 410. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 411. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of

special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 412. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78) is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000."

SEC. 413. Titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.

Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.

Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.

Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.

Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.

Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.

Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.

Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.

Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.

Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.

Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.

East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.

El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.

Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.

Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.

Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities: $168,000.

Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.

Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.

Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.

Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.

Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.

New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.

Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.

Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.

Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.

Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.

San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.

San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.

San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.

Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.

Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.

Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.

Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.

Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.

Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.

Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.

Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.

Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.

Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.

Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.

Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.

Colville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

Dermott, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.

Dover, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.

Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.

Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.

Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Heber Springs, Arkansas: Training facilities, $90,000.

Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.

Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.

Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.

Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.

Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.

Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.

Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.

Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.

Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.

Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Riverdale, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.

Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.

Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.

San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.

Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.

Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.

Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.

Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.

Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.

Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities and operational facilities, $364,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and troop housing, $188,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Utilities and ground improvements, $4,963,000.

Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $426,000.

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee:

Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $192,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any

facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided,* That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 3 of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."

"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."

"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000;" and by striking out in clause (2) (b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place

thereof "$12,446,000;" and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,702,000".

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army Reserve, $20,748,000;

(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,451,000;

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States $15,536,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1) (a), (1) (b), (2), (3) (a), and (3) (b) of section 504, respectively.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959."

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the

United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site for a United States Army Reserve Center: *Provided*, That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer

and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.

SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts except that any moneys received under ~~section 1~~ *section 601* (2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged.

Union Calendar No. 69

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5674

[Report No. 223]

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

MARCH 13, 1959

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MARCH 18, 1959

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

H. R. 5674

A BILL

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 16, 1959
For actions of April 15, 1959
86th-1st, No. 56

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....16
Area redevelopment.....2
ASC committees.....42
Budget.....19
CCC.....4,10,20
Civil defense.....27,38
Coffee.....45
Commodity exchange.....45
Contracts.....25
Cooperatives.....12
Cotton.....11
Credit unions.....35
Dairy products.....7
Economic advisers.....20
Eggs.....15
Electrification.....1
Expenditures.....19
Fair trade.....33
Farm program.....14,30,46
Food stamps.....39
Food storage.....31
Foreign aid.....26,28,40
Forestry.....3,21
Insecticides.....47
Interest rates.....8
Irrigation.....17
Lands.....29,37,44
Legislative program.....10
Military construction.....4
Milk.....12
Minerals.....37,44
Minimum wage.....9
Nominations.....20
Personnel.....22,34
Plants.....47
Potatoes.....32
Property.....36
Public Law 480.....4,10
Reclamation.....5
Research.....12,17
Roads.....21
Small business.....43
Sugar.....18
Surplus commodities.....41
Surplus foods.....23
Unemployment.....24
Unemployment compensation.....16
Water pollution.....6
Water resources.....13

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to give REA Administrator authority over all loans. Senate passed bill to authorize rental of cotton acreage allotments. Senate ordered reported bills to: Provide industrial-use research, expand special milk program. House subcommittee voted to report area redevelopment bill. Sen. Symington urged Secretary to submit omnibus farm bill. Senate received nomination of Frank A. Barrett to be member of CCC board. Senate committee reported measure to establish committee to study water resources. Sen. Humphrey urged USDA program to purchase eggs. Sens. Symington and Humphrey introduced and discussed food stamp bill. Rep. Sullivan introduced and discussed bill to provide for regulation of futures trading in coffee.

HOUSE

1. ELECTRIFICATION. Passed, 254 to 131, as reported H. R. 1321, to give the REA Administrator additional authority. Then passed S. 144, a similar Senate bill, without amendment. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 5383-401

As finally passed, S. 144 provides that the functions and activities of REA and of the Administrator of REA which were transferred to the Department and to the Secretary by Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 are transferred to the REA Administrator, to be exercised and administered within the Department by the Administrator under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary, except that insofar as such functions relate to the approval or disapproval of loans authorized to be made under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, their exercise by the Administrator shall not be subject to the supervision or direction of, or to any other

control by, the Secretary.

Rep. Simpson criticized TVA for its awarding of a turbogenerator contract to a British firm and urged that the decision be reversed. pp. 5434-6

2. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. A subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee voted to report with amendment to the full committee S. 722, the Douglas area redevelopment bill. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, reduces the original $389.5 million to $251 million, decreasing from $100 million to $75 million the amount of loans available to rural areas. p. 5420

3. FORESTS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2497, to add certain lands located in Idaho to the Boise and Payette National Forests (H. Rept. 273). p. 5436

4. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 5674, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including an authorization for use of Public Law 480 and CCC funds. p. 5436

5. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported without amendment the following bills: H. R. 1778, to amend section 17 (b) of the Reclamation Act of 1939 to defer payment of certain payments of construction costs by water users; and H. R. 839, to approve certain adjusting, deferring, and canceling of certain irrigation charges against non-Indian owned lands near the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Washington. p. D250

6. WATER POLLUTION. The Public Works Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 3610, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works and to establish the Office of Water Pollution Control. p. D251

7. DAIRY PRODUCTS. The Administration Committee ordered reported a resolution to authorize printing of 5,000 additional copies of a report entitled, "Price Discrimination in the Distribution of Dairy Products." p. D250

8. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Patman criticized Administration monetary policies, particularly "high-interest rate policies." pp. 5421-7

9. MINIMUM WAGES. Rep. Thompson, N. J., urged an increase in the minimum wage, and criticized the Secretary for opposing such an increase. pp. 5415-8

10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that on Thurs., April 16, H. R. 5674, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including an authorization for use of Public Law 480 and CCC funds, would be programed and that Rep. Vinson will ask for a rollcall vote on that bill. p. 5403

SENATE

11. COTTON. Passed without amendment S. 1455, to authorize 1-year leases of upland cotton acreage allotments from farms having allotments of 10 acres or less to other farms in the same county if the combined allotments will not exceed 50 acres. pp. 5340-7

12. RESEARCH; MILK; COOPERATIVES. The Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported the following bills: p. D247

S. 690, without amendment, to provide a program for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes;

86TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 272

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5674

APRIL 15, 1959.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 245]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 245, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

O

House Calendar No. 53

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 245

[Report No. 272]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 15, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the

bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 53

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 245

[Report No. 272]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H.R. 5674, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. THORNBERRY

APRIL 15, 1959

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

H. RES. 215

RESOLUTION

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 17, 1959
For actions of April 16, 1959
86th-1st, No. 57

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....17
Adjournment.....11
Buildings.....18
CCC.....6
Cooperatives.....2
Corn.....13
Electrification.....15
Employment.....10
Farm credit.....9
Farm prices.....13
Farm program.....12
Food for peace.....16
Industrial uses.....1
Inflation.....10
Military construction....6
Milk.....2,19
Personnel.....20
Price supports.....8
Public Law 480.....6,16
REA loans.....15
Research.....1
Soil bank.....17
Special milk.....2
Sugar.....21
Tobacco.....8
Trade fairs.....3
Vehicles.....20
Water.....4
Wheat.....5,7,14

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported bills to: Expand industrial-use research. Expand special milk program. House committee ordered reported bill to revise price support level for tobacco. Sen. Humphrey and others introduced and Sen. Humphrey discussed bill to expand Public Law 480 and establish Peace Food Administration.

SENATE

1. RESEARCH. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 690, which would establish an Agricultural Research and Industrial Administration in this Department to conduct research on the development of new and improved uses for farm products (S. Rept. 193). p. 5441

2. MILK. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 1289, to increase and extend the special milk program for children (S. Rept. 194), and without amendment S. 753, to authorize cooperative associations of milk producers to bargain with purchasers singly or in groups (S. Rept. 192). p. 5441

3. TRADE FAIRS. Passed without amendment H. R. 5508, to provide permanently for the free importation of articles for exhibition at fairs, exhibitions, or expositions. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 5489

4. WATER RIGHTS. Received a Kan. Legislature resolution urging the enactment of legislation to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the States. p. 5440

5. WHEAT. This office has received copies of an Agriculture and Forestry Committee print of a wheat stabilization bill. The draft includes provisions for percentage reductions in farm acreage allotments, penalties based on actual yield, increase in the penalty rate, reductions in exemptions, a limitation of $25,000 in price supports for any person in any year, no price support for non-cooperators, and applicability of the proposed legislation to only the 1960 and 1961 crops.

HOUSE

6. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Passed, 377 to 7, with amendments H. R. 5674, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including an authorization for use of Public Law 480 and CCC funds. pp. 4592-5515 ~~5492-5514~~
Concerning the use of Public Law 480 funds for defense purposes in foreign countries, Rep. Gross stated that "this is another subsidy which should not be charged in full to the farmers of America." p. 5496

7. WHEAT ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture Committee recommitted to the Wheat Subcommittee H. R. 3436, to increase the durum-wheat acreage allotments in North Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, South Dakota, and California, and H. R. 5443, providing for the appointment by the Secretary, of a committee to study and recommend increases in durum-wheat allotments. p. D255

8. TOBACCO. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 5058, to modify the price-support level for tobacco. p. D255

9. FARM CREDIT. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported without amendment H. R. 6353, to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from FCA to the Federal land banks. p. D255

10. INFLATION; EMPLOYMENT. Rep. Reuss discussed his bill, H. R. 6263, "to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for its more effective administration, and to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability," which requires the President to hold public hearings on prospective or actual price and wage increases and to issue summaries of such hearings. He stated that the Administration, the AFL-CIO, the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Federal Reserve Board oppose it. pp. 5520-4

11. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 20. p. 5530

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Thurmond inserted an article discussing some of the agricultural problems, stating that the farm program is for everybody "except the little farmer" and offering suggestions for improvements. pp. A3127-8
Rep. Loser inserted a reprint of an article listing results of a poll, including questions on the farm program. p. A3141
Extension of remarks of Rep. Brewster expressing concern about the "spiraling cost of administering a program which has failed to accomplish its primary stated purpose -- to help the low-income farmer ..." p. A3148
Rep. Levering inserted excerpts from a book written by J. C. Penny expressing the importance of a successful farm program and the value of preserving our soil. pp. A3170-1

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., B.D., Th. M., offered the following prayer:

In the first book of the Bible 4: 9 we read: *and the Lord said unto Cain, "Where is Abel thy brother?" and he said, "I know not: Am I my brother's keeper?"*

Father-God, Creator of man, help each Congress man and woman in this great body to realize he is his brother's keeper.

As legislation is premeditated in the minds of these servants of the people of these United States, imprint, indelibly, inerasably, inexpungibly, upon each person as he works in this enclosure and the confines of his office the fact that he is his brother's keeper.

We feel, dear Heavenly Father, that if this is kept before our thinking we will see helpful, constructive legislation enacted.

Great Physician, if it is in Thy will, lay Thy hand on the body of Mr. Dulles.

This request I make conscientiously and sincerely in the name of my Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1959, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1455. An act to authorize the rental of cotton acreage allotments.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1096. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. THURMAN A. WHITESIDE ET AL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 15, 1959.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Thurman A. Whiteside, et al.* (No. 856–58), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that the Clerk may not, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without consent.

The subpena in question is herewith, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman withhold that so that I may offer a resolution?

Mr. GROSS. No. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Adair	Holifield	Quigley
Andersen, Minn.	Holland	Rhodes, Ariz.
	Huddleston	Rooney
Baring	Kearns	Rostenkowski
Baumhart	Keogh	Roush
Blatnik	Kowalski	Santangelo
Bonner	Meader	Scott
Buckley	Merrow	Simpson, Pa.
Carnahan	Miller, George P.	Smith, Kans.
Cramer		Stubblefield
Daddario	Mitchell	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Moeller	Teller
Dent	Monagan	Tollefson
Diggs	Moorhead	Van Pelt
Downing	Moulder	Weis
Giaimo	Multer	Whitener
Gray	Norblad	Whitten
Griffin	Norrell	Williams
Harris	Pilcher	Wilson
Hechler	Polk	Winstead
Hoffman, Ill.	Powell	Wolf

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. THURMAN A. WHITESIDE ET AL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* THURMAN A. WHITESIDE, ET AL., DEFENDANTS.—No. 856–58

To Ralph Roberts, Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia at 3d and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, in the city of Washington, on the 20th day of April 1959, at 9:45 o'clock a.m., to testify in the case of *United States* v. *Thurman A. Whiteside* and bring with you all records as per the attached list.

A. Summary of contents of Harris committee files.

B. Fitzgerald memorandums re Foster trust:

Fitzgerald memo re Foster trust negotiations with Whiteside, March 9, 1956, and telephone converastion with Whiteside March 12, 1956.

Fitzgerald memo re Foster trust, March 28, 1956.

Fitzgerald memo of Foster trust settlement.

C. Harris committee correspondence:

Anderson-Harris letter, February 7, 1958.
Katzentine-Moulder letter, July 24, 1957.
Kefauver-Moulder, June 28, 1957.
Kefauver-Moulder, June 28, 1957.
Kefauver-Harris letter, February 26, 1958.
Kefauver-Harris letter, March 10, 1958.
Mack-Moulder letter, February 8, 1958.
Magnuson-Harris letter, March 5, 1958.
Schoeppel-Harris letter, March 5, 1958.
Scott-Harris letter, February 9, 1958.
Smathers-Harris letter, March 5, 1958.

Steinmeyer-Harris letter, February 27, 1958, with enclosure of papers relating to real estate transaction of Steinmeyer and Mack.

D. Mack bank statements:

Mack deposits in Munsey Trust Co.

Mack: Bank deposits in First National Bank, Fort Lauderdale, July 1, 1955–February 10, 1958.

Mack: Bank records of checks over $200 drawn on First National Bank, Fort Lauderdale, June 30, 1955–October 31, 1957.

E. Katzentine notes, memorandums, conversations:

Katzentine notes on Katzentine's affidavit of February 17, 1957.

Katzentine summary of channel 10 chronology, March 8, 1956.

Katzentine's (?) notes on chronology of channel 10, undated.

Analysis of channel 10 decision (presumably by Katzentine).

Memorandum re McCoaker-Prosser-Merritt-Katzentine conference re desirability of seeking TV station, March 23, 1951.

Katzentine memo on Foster trust negotiation, March 30, 1956.

Katzentine-Joe Adams telephone conversation, April 6, 1956.

Katzentine-Berke conversation June 11, 1954.

Katzentine-Charlie Johns telephone conversation April 6, 1956.
Katzentine-Prosser-Scott memorandum, December 1, 1955.
Katzentine memo of Storer-Prosser-Katzentine telephone conversation, December 1, 1952.
Katzentine memo on Whiteside telephone conversation, April 23, 1956.
F. Katzentine correspondence:
Katzentine-Childs letter, May 25, 1956.
Katzentine-Kefauver letter, June 6, 1955.
Katzentine-Kefauver letter, December 27, 1956.
Katzentine-Kefauver letter, January 21, 1957.
Katzentine-Kefauver letter, February 1, 1957.
Katzentine-Kefauver letter, June 4, 1957.
Katzentine-Moulder letter, July 24, 1957, photostat.
Katzentine-Moulder letter, July 24, 1957, carbon.
Katzentine-Porter letter, April 1, 1955.
Katzentine-Porter letter, November 22, 1955.
Katzentine-Porter letter, November 22, 1955.
Katzentine-Porter letter, December 23, 1955.
Katzentine-Porter letter, January 5, 1956.
Katzentine-Porter letter, February 24, 1956.
Katzentine-Porter letter, January 31, 1957.
Katzentine-Porter letter, February 15, 1957.
Katzentine-Porter letter, February 2(?), 1957.
Katzentine-Porter letter, March 7, 1957, with picture of Mrs. Baker and Mrs. Moore.
Holland-Katzentine letter, June 2, 1955.
Miller-Katzentine telegram, October 5, 1955.
Rice-Katzentine letter, November 4, 1955.
G. O'Hara-McLaughlin interviews at the FCC:
O'Hara-McLaughlin memo of interview with Craven, March 13, 1958.
O'Hara-McLaughlin memo of interview with Doerfer, March 13, 1958.
O'Hara-McLaughlin memo of interview with Hyde, March 13, 1958.
O'Hara-McLaughlin memo of interview with Lee, March 13, 1958.
H. Shacklette-Eastland interviews in Miami:
Shacklette-Eastland interview with Carter, January 8, 1958.
Shacklette-Eastland interview with Anderson, January 15, 1958.
Shacklette memo of Baker and Hardy interview, January 17, 1958.
Shacklette-Eastland-O'Hara interview with Mack, January 27, 1958.
Shacklette-Eastland memo of interview with Fuqua, January 13, 1958.
Shacklette memo of interview with Knight, December 21, 1957.
Shacklette interview of Palmer, December 11, 1957.
Shacklette-Eastland memo of interview with Scott, January 16, 1958.
Shacklette-Eastland memo of Sheldon interview, January 14, 1958.
Gloria C. Harkins statement to Shacklette, December 18, 1957.
Robert R. White statement to Shacklette, December 19, 1957.
I. Whiteside-Barber-Mack telephone records:
Summary of telephone calls, Whiteside to Mack.
Summary of telephone calls, Mack to Whiteside.
Summary of telephone calls, Barber to Whiteside.
Summary, Mack-Barber telephone calls to persons other than Whiteside.
Memorandum of transmittal of information re telephone calls.
J. Miscellaneous correspondence:
Barber-Whiteside letter, January 18, 1956.
Carter-FCC, July 18, 1951.
Carter-McDonald letter, January 10, 1955.
Holland-Katzentine letter, June 2, 1955.
Isberg-Pearson letter, January 25, 1957.
Kefauver-Harris letter 3, February 26, 1958.
Kefauver-Harris letter, March 10, 1958.
Kefauver-Katzentine letter, December 20, 1956.
Kefauver-Moulder letter, June 28, 1957.
Miller-Katzentine telegram, October 5, 1955.
Rice-Katzentine letter, November 4, 1955.
Rice-Katzentine letter, November 4, 1955.
Rice-Sullivan letter, October 6, 1955.
Rice-Sullivan letter, October 13, 1955.
Scott-Brown letter, February 14, 1957.
Smathers-Harris letter, March 5, 1958.
Smathers-Wilson letter typed on February 15, 1954, dictated on February 12, 1954.
Sullivan-Kefauver letter, Juy 26, 1955.
K. Miscellaneous memorandums and statements:
American Aviation Daily, February 6, 1957—clipping re Eastern intervention in channel 10 case.
Memorandum re Alterman Transport Lines loan to Mack (probably by Shacklette).
Fitzgerald (FCC) statement of reasons for delay in preparation of draft decision in channel 10 case.
Harkins memo of Sheldon-Katzentine telephone conversation, March 19, 1956.
Harkins, Gloria C., statement to Shacklette, December 18, 1957.
Mack campaigns, contributors.
Rice memorandum re Baker, May 24, 1956.
Summary of travel of Whiteside during 1957.
Memorandum (probably by Shacklette) re Foster trust, March 8, 1956.
White, Robert D., statement to Shacklette, dated June 2, 1955.
L. Berger-Wachtell-Gelman memorandums:
Berger-Gelman memo on review of National Airlines files, January 17, 1958.
Berger-Wachtell interview with Mack on January 14, 1958, dated January 15, 1958.
Berger-Wachtell memo re interview with Mack on January 17, 1958, dated January 20, 1958.
Berger memo re review of materials on file at FCC, dated February 5, 1958.
Wachtell memo re FCC-Miami channel 10 case, dated February 6, 1958 (Wachtell-Eastland interview with Harry Plotkin).
Wachtell memo re FCC-Miami channel 10 case, dated February 7, 1958 (Wachtell-Eastland interview with Paul Porter).
Memo note re Roy Cohn, undated, originator of memo unknown.
This subpena is issued upon application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
By LAWRENCE PROCTOR,
Deputy Clerk.

APRIL 1959.

ARTHUR HILLAND,
Attorney for Defendant Thurman A. Whiteside.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H.R. 246) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of *United States* v. *Thurman A. Whiteside et al.* (criminal case No. 856–58), pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before said court at 9:45 antemeridian on the 20th day of April 1959, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be is further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice, or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in possession of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 245 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such

amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the reading of the resolution indicates, it makes in order the consideration of H.R. 5674, familiarly known as the military public-works authorization bill.

This is an open rule and provides for 2 hours of general debate.

In appearing before the Committee on Rules, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, gave a very detailed and excellent report of what the Committee on Armed Services had done in examining the requests of the Department of Defense for this authorization.

It is my opinion that the committee has done an excellent job. I am convinced from what the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, presented to the Committee on Rules, and from a careful examination of the report of the committee on H.R. 5674, that this is a well-considered bill and one which has been carefully studied by the Committee on Armed Services.

When the first requests came in from the field offices of the military departments outlining the needs of the various facilities, both in this country and outside this country, they totaled over $4 billion. In turn, they were reduced by the military departments in the Pentagon to $2,130,604,000. A review of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations reduced this figure to $1,368,554,000, which was further reduced to $1,299,-297,000 by the Bureau of the Budget.

After the Committee on Armed Services finished with its examination of this request from the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense, the committee further reduced, and it now comes to us $109,247,000 under the budget. The total authorization for new construction called for in titles I, II, and III of this bill amounts to $1,190,-050,000.

Added to this figure should be the amount of $57,128,000 recommended in title V of this bill by the committee for construction of facilities for each of the Reserve components and that for deficiency authorizations of $560,000. This brings the total authorization called for in the bill to $1,251,907,000.

I congratulate the chairman and the members of the Committee on Armed Services for the excellent job it has done. In reporting out H.R. 5674, the committee issued a unanimous report favoring its adoption.

I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the consideration of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

(Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to speak out of order.)

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, every one of us are very sorry at the resignation of John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. John Foster Dulles is a remarkable man, one whom I admire very much. He and I have been sort of kindred spirits in connection with the fundamental problems that confront the world of today. Not that I am associating myself with him from the angle of trying to enhance myself, but it happens that he and I, on fundamental policies concerning our country, looked pretty much eye to eye.

I admired him not only for his great capacity, but for his determination and his strong willpower, and for the great moral courage he has always displayed. Whether one agreed with him or not on every one of his policies, everyone knows that he is a dedicated American and that the policies that he devised or helped to devise he felt were for the best interests of our country. He will go down in history, in my opinion, as one of the outstanding Secretaries of States of our great Nation.

During this trying period in the world's history he has served as a bulwark of strength not only to our country but to the nations of the world who want to be free under their own law. He was always a constant hope to the hundreds of millions of captive citizens or residents of satellite nations who are subject to Communist viciousness and dictatorship but who are hoping for the early return of their liberties and of the independence of their country.

I am glad to note that President Eisenhower will continue to look to him for advice and will continue to consult with him. We all hope that God will shower his blessings upon him and improve his health so that he will be with us for many years to come, and that he will be able to give to President Eisenhower and to our country, in the trying days ahead the benefit of his great capacity, his strength of character, and of his moral courage.

John Foster Dulles knows the Communist mind. He knows the origin of the thinking of the Communists. And, unless one knows the origin of the thinking of the Communists he is going to be deceived by what they say and what they do. John Foster Dulles knows that Communist thinking—and I am talking about the Communists in fact, those in the Kremlin and other Communists in fact—originates in one word.

That word is "hate"—the idea that might is right, the grave is the end, the state is all-powerful, the individual is only a cog in the wheel of state to be used as those in control, the dictator and the clique around him, want to use him.

Unless one understands the origin of the thinking of the Communist mind he will be deceived by what they say and what they do. John Foster Dulles knows the origin of the Communist thinking, the "hate" that dominates their minds. They are the prisoners of an ideology that emanates from "hate," hatred of everything that is contrary to what they want and what they believe in, their false ideology.

I think the finest evidence of John Foster Dulles' greatness is the fact that the Kremlin fears him, because any man the Kremlin fears must possess qualities that are of the highest nature from the angle of those who want freedom under their own law.

I hope the successor of John Foster Dulles, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, will follow the policy of firmness that John Foster Dulles so well exemplified, many times under trying conditions when he was misunderstood. I hope that in the Foreign Ministers meeting we will insist, as the President has said and as John Foster Dulles has so well said, on evidence of progress being made before we enter into the summit meeting, for John Foster Dulles, as I know him and read him, would never stand for a summit meeting at any price. To me, that would be a dangerous role for the free world to follow. I hope our country will adhere to that policy, and I hope his successor, whoever may be appointed, will have the firmness and the moral courage that John Foster Dulles possesses.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I commend the majority leader on the very splendid statement he has made. We all realize the sentiment that prompts it. We all realize the admiration and the respect that is involved in what he has just said. It is further evidence of the fact that when matters involving the security of our country, our foreign policy, are before us, there is no center aisle to divide us.

May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that on yesterday on the floor I had a few words to say of respect, admiration, and gratitude for John Foster Dulles, so I shall not say anything further at this time. However, I did want to commend the gentleman on the admirable statement he has just made.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I appreciate what my friend has said. What I have said represents not only my own views. I try to be objective-minded. I have watched John Foster Dulles through the years, and my admiration for him has increased and increased. My feeling has progressed from one that was not so favorable to him to one of intense admiration as I have watched the man, as I have analyzed his mind and seen his grim determination and great courage, all for the national interest of our country. So I express not only my own views but I am confident I express those not of Democrats or Republicans in this House but of all of us as Americans.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration

of the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5674, with Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time at I may require.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 5674, is known as the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1960.

This is strictly an authorization bill.

The grand total of all authorities granted in the bill is $1,251,907,000.

Now, this total is made up of a number of elements and is broken down as follows: Army, $199,045,000; Navy, $182,283,000; Air Force, $808,722,000; Reserve components, $57,128,000; deficiency authorization, $4,729,000.

As I stated a moment ago, the grand total of all these authorities is $1,251,907,000.

Let me call your attention to the fact that these deficiency authorizations, totoling $4.7 million, represents increases in cost for previously authorized projects. Either the original estimate of cost was too low or it is attributable to a rise in cost.

I might say in this connection, I am pleased to draw your attention to the fact that 2 years ago, the deficiency authorization was $183 million. And last year it was $43 million. This indicates that the construction programs being submitted by the Department of Defense are better planned and better thought out than they have been in the past.

RESCISSIONS

Also in the past, there was a great gap between authorizations and appropriations. This the committee felt was unwise. I am happy to report that an automatic repealer provision which we placed in the bill several years ago and which has appeared in it each year since is bringing these authorizations and appropriations into reasonable balance today.

Here is how they line up: Unfunded authorization at the end of fiscal 1957 was almost $2.2 billion. At the end of fiscal 1958, the figure was $1.9 billion. The estimated amount of unfunded authorization at the end of this fiscal year—1959—is about $1 billion.

I am glad to state that the Department estimates that the amount of unfunded authorization which will be available at the end of fiscal year 1960 will be only about $444 million.

APPROPRIATIONS TO BE REQUESTED

For this construction, the Department of Defense is requesting from the Appropriations Committee $1,479 million for the Regular Forces and $61 million for the Reserve construction. This figure, of course, is somewhat larger than the bill and this is explained by the fact that some previous authority is also being funded this year.

Now, this construction bill and the justification for it is, of course, a reflection of the size of our Armed Forces. This year, it is based on 870,000 men in the Army, 864 ships in the Navy, and 102 wings authorized for June 30, 1960, for the Air Force.

Each of the services has its physical plant requirement which, together with the men and the weapons, makes up the total of our defense. The physical plant is an absolutely essential part of the defense structure and it must be improved, added to, and kept modern all of the time.

Now, a bill of this kind has its origin in the requests made by the field establishments of the three services. It is then submitted through channels to the particular military department headquarters in Washintgon. That department reviews it and it is finally submitted to the Secretary of the military department for his approval. The program then goes to the Secretary of Defense, and specifically to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, a position now very competently held by Mr. Floyd S. Bryant.

Mr. Bryant's job is to review and coordinate all of the military construction programs, making certain, for example, that facilities of one service that are not now being used to full capacity be used by another service. This office takes the overall view of the total construction program.

Following this process this year from a dollar standpoint, the picture is this: The field offices of the three departments made requests for construction totaling over $4 billion. This was cut by the military departments themselves to about $2,131 million. Mr. Bryant's office cut this figure to $1,368 million and the review by the Bureau of the Budget resulted in a bill of only $1,299,297,000.

The committee, after its close and detailed scrutiny of the bill by line item, cut $109 million from the program so that the bill which you have before you now represents a total of $1,190,050,000.

All of the figures that I have just given refer to the program for the Regular establishment. The Reserve portion of the bill, which totals about $57 million, remained pretty stable throughout the reviews and I, therefore, have not injected it into this overall picture.

The bill contains almost 2,000 individual line items. These line items are carried in what are called backup books and I have brought one of these books—only one of them—today in order that you can have some idea of the amount of detailed study which goes into one of these bills. This particular book has 347 pages and it is only 1 of 10 books.

I know you realize that it would be impossible for me to go into any great detail with respect to a program of this size within the limitations of time allotted for the consideration of this bill. Indeed, it would take as long for me to explain it in that fashion as it took the committee to study it during its hearings.

Therefore, I will deal with some of the highlights of the program in order to make the general picture clear.

Of the total amount requested, over $400 million, or 31 percent, is in direct support of our ballistic missile programs of the three services. Approximately $266 million, or 20 percent, is for expanding air defense systems; $223 million, or 17 percent, is to support research and development and missile defense; and $110 million, or 10 percent, is to improve the capabilities of the Strategic Air Command.

This does not total 100 percent but gives the major portions of the total bill.

I would also like to describe the highlights of the programs for each of the three military departments. Prior to doing that, however, I would like to point out one important fact which goes directly to the question of construction costs, and that is, that 96 percent of all the construction contracts let by the military departments during fiscal year 1958 were on a bid basis.

The competition is strong and the prospective contractors make the closest possible estimates in order to get the jobs. There is no greater assurance, to my mind, of getting a dollar's worth of construction for a dollar spent than this bid process.

ARMY

Let us look first at the Army program. Almost 30 percent, or $67 million, is for facilities in support of research, development, and test activities of the Nike-Zeus program. Over 21 percent, or almost $50 million, is for the construction of Nike-Hercules, Hawk, and Missile Master facilities in the United States and overseas. The other percentages are all relatively small and I will describe only a few of them.

Six percent, or $14 million, is for maintenance and storage facilities at major existing installations in the United States and overseas. Almost 5 percent is for essential utilities at our major installations within the United States. These utilities include emergency powerplants, heating systems, sewage disposal, storm drainage, roads, and other such items.

Only 4 percent of the Army program is devoted to service clubs, chapels, schools, and other similar facilities.

NAVY

The Navy program has no individual large percentage breakdowns. The largest, as a matter of fact, is 18 percent, or $35 million, to support aircraft carriers of the carrier striking force. Fifteen percent, or almost $30 million, is for barracks and bachelor officers quarters and their allied facilities. Fourteen percent, or almost $28 million, is devoted to missile programs and particularly,

those related to the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.

All of the other percentages are relatively small. Typical of them is $11 million or 6 percent for construction in connection with the eastward extension of the distant early warning line.

AIR FORCE

By far the large portion of the Air Force program is represented by construction in support of ballistic missiles. This comprises 43 percent, or $374 million, of the Air Force total.

Almost 9 percent—or $77 million—is for construction of facilities within the United States to support the Strategic Air Command.

Four percent—or $34 million—relates to construction for fighter interceptor squadrons at bases in and outside the United States.

The next largest percentage is only 3.8 percent—or $44½ million—for work in support of the ballistic missile early warning system.

All the remaining divisions of the program are in the 1 to 3 percent category.

Let me say that in reviewing the requirements of the Air Force, we are trying to take into consideration that in the course of time, manpowered aircraft will gradually fade away like the battleship faded away for the aircraft carrier. It is our hope and expectation that many of these installations can be used in the missile era without requiring any construction of a support or logistic nature.

I might say at this point that all of these breakdowns which I have given are dealt with in very much greater detail in the report. I feel that almost any question which might arise in your mind can find its answer in the report which has numerous headings and clearly understandable divisions.

LAND

Last year when I was presenting this bill, I stated that I was happy to announce that the land acquisition contemplated by the bill was the smallest in many years. This year, I can state that the program is even smaller than last year, totaling only 3,062 acres in fee and 1,302 acres in easements for a total cost of $2,086,000. In this connection, and knowing of the strong interest that we all have in the land holdings of the military departments, I would like to direct your attention to page 30 of the report which deals with this subject in some detail.

From this portion of the report, it is clear that every effort is being made to keep land acquisitions at a minimum while disposing of the maximum amount of defense real estate, consistent, of course, with our continuing needs.

Also, relating to this matter of real estate are some interesting facts set out on page 32 of the report which illustrates how existing installations belonging to one military department are being made available to another military department. You will see several typical recent examples of how well this exchange of properties is working out.

NEW BASES

I am happy to advise again this year that there are no truly new bases in the program. There are, of course, some new radar stations and similar facilities but no major bases of any kind have been added to the inventory by this bill.

FAMILY HOUSING

The family housing program is progressing in quite satisfactory fashion. Where there were over 50,000 Capehart units last year, there are only 20,676 units this year. And as for appropriated fund housing, where there were 935 last year, there are only 473 this year.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

I mentioned previously the great number of line items in this bill—almost 2,000 of them. The bill which you have before you, of course, is a clean bill with only a few last minute amendments, almost all of which are merely to correct typographical errors.

The bill on which the committee held its hearings, however, was amended in over 70 instances and as I have said, virtually all of these amendments were by way of reductions in the program—over $109 million of them.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Title V of the bill will provide specific line item project authorization for fiscal year 1960 for each of the Reserve components in the following amounts: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000; Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000; Air National Guard, $15,536,000; Army Reserve, $20,748,000; Army National Guard, $8,451,000; for a total authorization of $57,128,000.

In addition, this title provides for the correction of deficiencies in cost estimates for several items authorized by the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958—title VI of last year's military construction bill—amounting to $560,000, and for a rescission of $2,022,000 of previous authorization of projects no longer required by the respective Reserve components because of reprograming.

The Department of Defense had requested a total of $56,995,000 of authorization for new projects during fiscal year 1960. The Committee on Armed Services carefully screened these requests in connection with its review of the total requirements of the Reserve forces facilities program and concluded that the requests were well justified and the progress of the entire program satisfactory.

Accordingly the committee approved the entire program requested by the Department of Defense and added two minor additions amounting to $135,000.

The proposed authorization provided for the Reserve components for fiscal year 1960, therefore, is $57,128,000.

CONCLUSION

Now, that is the military construction bill for fiscal year 1960. While I have dealt only with the highlights of the bill, I hope that my remarks coupled with the very detailed report, will give you a picture sufficiently clear to warrant your support of this important legislation.

This bill merely represents one of the three essential elements of our Defense Establishment—construction—the other two, of course, being the men and the equipment.

This bill does nothing more than provide the essential construction items needed to provide a base from which our forces can fight both in this country and overseas.

I have noted the fact that a great many details relating to the program are contained in the report which is available to every Member. The hearings have been printed and are also available. And, of course, they have even greater detail since this year the committee made a special effort to hold most of its hearings in open session. Almost all of the committee's deliberations are contained in the hearing. Only the highly classified details with respect to some of the items were heard in closed session.

Mr. Chairman, if I have not used the time allotted me, 20 minutes, I will be glad to yield to any Member for any question that he may wish to ask.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman will anticipate my question because I have asked it every year for the last 9 or 10 years. Is there any money in this bill for the Truman airport at Grand View, Mo.?

Mr. VINSON. A few years ago, as a result of the constant inquiry by the gentleman and his calling it the Truman Air Force Base, we changed the name, not to mislead him, of course, because that could not be done, nor would we do that, but we felt that we should honor two outstanding officers who made the supreme sacrifice and it is now named after them. This place that used to be referred to in a most inquisitive manner by our able and distinguished colleague from Iowa no longer is known as Grandview, but it is Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Mo. Yes; there is some money in this bill for it. The total amount is $866,000.

Mr. GROSS. But the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Iowa will always remember it as the Truman Airport.

Mr. VINSON. Yes. And, I want to compliment the gentleman on the scrutiny with which he has always followed this; scrutiny not only with reference to this bill but all other bills that come in the House. I know of no Member that is more diligent in studying legislation closely than my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and his kindness to me at all times.

Mr. VINSON. I mean every word of it.

Mr. GROSS. One other question. Has the Continental Air Command been moved to the Truman Air Base at Grandview, Mo.?

Mr. VINSON. No; it has not. This is an Air Defense Command base. The Continental Air Command stays at Mitchell Field, N.Y.

Mr. GROSS. I did not think it would ever be moved there.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee about the item of $10 million for the North American Air Defense Command which was contained in his original bill. I note this item was eliminated in the revised bill.

Mr. VINSON. I will be glad to inform the gentleman and the committee. When that matter was before the committee it had not been specifically located, and we were not warranted in spending money for bases where we do not know where they would be located. So, we hesitated and we did not make any appropriation. Now I understand it has been located. We did not include it in the bill. No doubt it might be considered for insertion after a hearing is had on the other side.

Mr. CHENOWETH. On March 20 it was announced that the new headquarters would be located in Cheyenne Mountain, near Colorado Springs.

Mr. VINSON. That was long after we had concluded our hearings and reported the bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman referred to waiting until the bill is considered in the Senate.

Mr. VINSON. I suggest that would be the proper way to consider the matter. We were not able to consider it because it had not been located.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is not opposed to the item, then?

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. CHENOWETH. And the only reason it was passed over was because the site had not been announced at the time the hearings were held.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. After the facts are brought out in the Senate, I am sure it will be taken care of.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if there is money in this bill to change the Nike bases to receive another type of missile.

Mr. VINSON. On that general subject I would like to say this: It is to be expected that as aviation fades away over a period of time—and man-powered aircraft is bound in the course of time to fade away, just like the battleship fadcd away before the airplane carrier—missiles will come into being. It is to be hoped that practically all of these bases that are now used for man-operated aircraft can be appropriately used without additional expenditure to set them up specifically for missile bascs. Did I answer the gentlewoman's question?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Is there money in the bill to change the Nike bases to receive another type of missile?

Mr. VINSON. I can recall nothing of that kind.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. In connection with military construction, to what extent are we using counterpart funds? Are we using them to the fullest extent possible?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, all I know about that is what I read in the papers when Members go abroad. We do not use counterpart funds. We use what is called Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

And that is in the bill with reference to certain construction abroad.

Mr. VANIK. In studying the provisions of the bill that deal with military housing construction abroad——

Mr. VINSON. That is Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. VANIK. I see there are limitations on room size and space size with respect to such expenditures that are made out of appropriated funds.

Mr. VINSON. There are appropriated fund houses in this bill. We prescribe how much money is involved and the types of the housing. There are also certain restrictions with reference to Capehart houses, and these appear in the basic Capehart law.

Mr. VANIK. Would that limitation preclude the use of counterpart funds for construction? Would it permit such construction outside of those limitations set forth in this bill?

Mr. VINSON. No; they would not. I do not want the gentleman to confuse his thinking between counterpart funds and Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

Mr. VANIK. I understand the distinction.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to hear the gentleman call attention to the fact that Public Law 480 funds are being used for defense purposes in foreign countries.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Which means inversely that this is another subsidy which should not be charged in full to the farmers of America.

Mr. VINSON. We do a great deal of work abroad through what is known as Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. In the Capehart housing field did the committee in any instance deviate from the request or the recommendations of the Department of Defense, or did the committee go along?

Mr. VINSON. Very little change. However, since the committee reported the bill, there have been three bases, but they do not increase the amount of dollars at all. They involve housing at bases that have been cleared by the Budget, and at the proper time I propose to offer an amendment to include these Capehart houses. When the bill was written up, they were not included. These places are 200 units at Quantico, 114 units at Loring Air Force Base, and 600 units at Travis Air Force Base in California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. This does not increase the amount of money at all. Everyone understands that every married officer in the service is entitled to a quarters allowance. It averages about $90 a month for all ranks. When they occupy a Capehart unit, or a direct-appropriated house, or any other Government facility, the quarters allowance is withheld. In the last 3 years we have been involved in about 152,000 units. When these houses are all paid for we will recover in the neighborhood of $180 million a year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON, I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee one thing I do not quite understand. I know what "classified" is, and I can understand why that should be in the bill. But what is the difference between various locations, locations not specified, as compared with classified locations?

Mr. VINSON. I think the question is warranted since these terms could very well cause confusion.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You have classified set out and I can understand that, but what would be the difference between a various location and a classified location?

Mr. VINSON. There frequently is no difference at all.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I could not understand. We have three different entries here, and I could not see why you could not call them all classified. I was merely asking why you did not put them all under one group of classified rather than have them put under separate groups. That is what I could not understand.

Mr. VINSON. Generally speaking, "various locations," when so referred to in the Air Force portion of the bill, for example, relate to aircraft control and warning sites throughout the United States. There are a great number of these and many of them involve only minor items of construction. "Classified" installations, of course, speak for themselves. "Locations not specified" appears three times in the bill and relates to the authority that Congress is granting this year, and has granted in the past, for what I will call "cmergency" construction. In other words, it is not known at this time how or where the authority would be used. Therefore, the locations are "not specified."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee has given a fine detailed description of what is in H.R. 5674 and the construction items that are contained in it.

First, as the chairman of the committee has indicated, the bill which is before us is to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States including authority for the construction of facilities for Reserve components. The total sum of the authorization contained in the bill is $1,251,957,000. The Army would be authorized almost $200 million, the Navy some $183 million and the Air Force $811 million, with a total of $57 million for the various units of the Reserve forces.

I want to assure every Member of the House that the committee, during its consideration of this program, has made a detailed examination of the projects which make up the bill and the major programs which they support. We found, during our hearings, that this bill is the result of sound detailed planning in the three military departments. The program was given repeated reviews within each military department, followed by additional reviews within the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget.

We found these reviews to be objective and thorough. As has been stated, the program originally presented by the field offices to the military departments totaled in excess of $4 billion. After review and screening within the military departments, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget, this amount was reduced to $1.3 billion.

The committee during its review cut over $109 million from the bill so that the total of the bill as you see it before you today is $1,251,957,000.

The committee found that there has been great improvement in the formulation of military construction programs, and it took particular care to verify that all projects included in this bill were needed to support long-term future military plans and to eliminate items for which a compelling military necessity did not exist.

I think that the whole purpose of the bill could well be expressed by stating that it contains construction which, first, is necessary in the support of new weapons systems and new defense concepts; second, is needed in the augmentation of existing bases to support changes in weapons and operating concepts due to advancing technological development and third, is required to modernize supporting facilities against the ravages of time in order to assure adequate support at a time of urgent or emergency demand.

Needless to say, military construction is the basic support needed for military operations. For many of our major weapons and defense programs, military construction is the initial step in programing and budgetary actions because of long leadtimes necessary to produce completed usable facilities. Also, because of the nature of new weapons systems and operational concepts, base facilities are increasingly becoming an integral part of the weapons systems. This is illustrated in the missile operating forces. Therefore, it is vital that construction be planned and started well in advance, so as to be ready when the new weapons are finished.

It was entirely clear from the testimony taken by the committee during its extended hearings that the basic policy of the Defense Department continues to have as principal elements, first, the consideration that our primary responsibility is that of protecting the ability of this country to retaliate with large weapons in case of an outbreak of general war; second, but equally pressing, the responsibility to provide a capacity to apply military force promptly in various local conflict areas of the free world, and, third, continuing a strong continental air defense and maintenance of open sea lanes. The items in this bill support these policies.

As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, the House has already heard the details of the bill from the chairman of the committee. I hold myself ready, as do all members of the committee, to answer any questions or provide any further information which any Member of the House may wish to have.

I will conclude on the note that the bill is a well-thought-out one, has received the closest study within the military departments, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and in the Bureau of the Budget. I think that the cuts made by the committee totaling $109 million speak for themselves.

I urge your support for this bill as a vital link in the total picture of our defense.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5674, and as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted extensive hearings on the authorization requested in H.R. 5674 for Reserve facility construction wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. VINSON on his very thorough analysis of the bill and also to briefly review that portion of the legislation concerned with Reserve matters.

Title V of H.R. 5674 contained the authorization requested for the construction of new facilities for all of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

A total of $57,128,000 of authorization for new projects, including expansions and alterations of existing facilities, has been requested. This total is divided as follows: $20,748,000 for the Army Reserve; $8,451,000 for the Army National Guard; $8,300,000 for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; $4,093,000 for the Air Force Reserve, and $15,536,000 for the Air National Guard.

I would like to briefly review the substance of these requests by various components.

ARMY RESERVE

In the case of the Army Reserve, authorization of $20,748,000 proposed for fiscal year 1960 comprises 62 new Army Reserve centers and approximately 75 projects of the nature of additions to present centers. Of the 62 new centers, 52 are the 2 smallest standard sizes—with capacities of 100 and 200 Reservists, respectively, and are proposed for the smaller cities and towns throughout the country. The proposed projects, other than the new centers, are mainly additions of training and vehicle maintenance space which have been found essential to the training program.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For the Army National Guard, the proposed fiscal year 1960 authorization of $8,451,000 comprises 47 new armories and 13 projects for conversion of present armories and 5 nonarmory projects which are maintenance and supply administrative facilities.

NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Approximately half of the $8.3 million of new project authorization proposal for the Reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps were for essential additional facilities at established Naval Air Reserve installations which serve both Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve aviation. The remainder is divided almost evenly between the Naval Surface Reserve, for five berthing piers and four training buildings, and the Marine Corps Reserve for five training centers.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

The relatively small request for the Air Force Reserve—$4,093,000—was justified by the Department of Defense as being the result of prior substantial fulfillment of its most urgent requirements and consists of a variety of operational and support facilities at eight locations, four of which are municipal airports and the remainder jointly utilized military airfields.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For the Air National Guard, the authorization request of $15,556,000 consists of high-priority requirements for the operation and support of the Air National Guard aircraft at 20 locations; 3 aircraft control and warning facilities, 2 of which are located in the Territory of Hawaii; and site preparation for one new airfield. Of the 20 flying installations 16 are at civil airports and 4 at jointly utilized military airfields.

In summary, it would appear at first blush that the authorization requested for the Army Reserve program of $20,748,000 is disproportionately higher than the amounts requested for the other Reserve components. However, although this authorization for fiscal year 1960 is indeed higher than that requested for the other Reserve components it is not disproportionate since it reflects the fact that the Army Reserve program has to date only achieved 35 percent of its total estimated facilities requirement whereas the Navy has accomplished 47 percent of its requirements, the Air Force Reserve and National Guard approximately 75 percent of its requirements, and the Army National Guard approximately 85 percent of its total estimated requirements.

Thus, the emphasis on Army Reserve facilities is made necessary by the fact that the program is appreciably behind

the others in development. This lag in development is directly the result of a lack of Army Reserve personnel prior to 1955. However, since the passage of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 by the Congress, which was designed to strengthen the Reserve forces of the United States, the strength of the Army Reserve program has increased significantly with the consequent necessity for new facilities not previously required.

In respect to overall estimated requirements of the Reserve facilities program, the Department of Defense has indicated that a total authorization of $1,125 million will be required to provide all the facilities believed necessary for the Reserve components.

Approximately 60 percent of this required authorization amounting to $668 million has already been approved by the Congress and enacted into law.

The current bill will authorize an additional $57,128,000 of authorization thus increasing the percentage of authorization of total estimated requirements to 65 percent.

The balance of 35 percent of future estimated requirements will be met by future legislation and, as witnesses from the Department of Defense have indicated, will be requested by the Department of Defense in amounts necessarily in step with future individual program requirements.

In this connection the committee explored the possibility of accelerating completion of the Reserve forces program by increasing the total dollar authorization for the construction of Reserve facilities during fiscal year 1960. However, after considerable deliberation the committee was of the opinion that the total authorization requested by the Department of Defense was adequate for the program and properly geared to future manpower and training requirements.

Therefore, the committee concluded that any substantial increase in Reserve facilities authorization would be premature and therefore in addition to failing to serve any useful purpose might possibly disrupt the orderly development of the overall Reserve program.

For these reasons the Committee on Armed Services approved the request of the Department of Defense for approximately $57 million of authorization for Reserve facilities construction without making any substantial changes.

I therefore urge unanimous support of this bill, since it will, among other things, permit the continued strengthening of our Reserve forces.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to speak about the Army's military public works authorization program.

The survival of this Nation and of the free world demands that we have a means to deter aggression or to defeat it if deterrence fails. Aggression may occur in many forms, from the massive thermonuclear attack on this continent to the peaceful seizure of free government by subversion.

The worldwide threat of aggression has its source in ambitious and ruthless Communist designs to isolate and destroy the United States, the center of free world resistance to Communist world domination. It is backed by the ominous and impressive military power of the Soviet Union, its allies, and its satellities, built around the largest standing armies in peacetime history and buttressed by a growing capability to deliver long-range nuclear weapons. This great military power casts its foreboding shadow over all Europe and Asia and under this protective cover the Communists have engaged in ceaseless probings to test the will of the free nations to resist. This power has been felt directly or indirectly in most of the 18 military conflicts that have occurred since the end of World War II. In every case the Communists have fought for limited objectives and their threats to world peace have been so indirect and ambiguous as not to provoke a general thermonuclear war. They have advanced by internal subversion and piecemeal military operations based primarily on ground forces.

The Army's construction authorization request for fiscal year 1960, which is contained in title I of H.R. 5674, represents the most modest requirement which could support the Army's missions and responsibilities in these troubled times. This Army request should by no means be construed as representing everything the Army feels that it needs. In truth, it is my understanding that this modest request represents only about one-fifth of what the Army's commanders requested to carry out their assigned missions. These commanders' requests were rigidly screened within the Army before the Army presented its request to the Department of Defense. That agency and the Bureau of the Budget, operating within a prescribed and austere budgetary ceiling, made further reductions in the request so that the amount finally considered by the committee amounted to little more than a half of what the Army considered as their minimal needs.

I do not wish to belabor this point, but I believe it is important to understand that this Army request has been developed and reviewed under a most critical and restrained set of guidelines.

Now, if I may, I would like to recount for you some of the more impressive contributions to our mutual safety which these Army requests will buy for us.

The most important of the Army's tasks today include the maintenance of forces overseas in support of our national policies and international commitments with our allies, furnishing of surface-to-air missile defense for the United States and our forces deployed overseas, and provision of a mobile combat-ready strategic force here in the United States for rapid reinforcement of our deployed forces in time of need.

In carrying out its assigned responsibilities and missions overseas the Army is maintaining 40 percent of its Active Army Forces in various areas of the world. To support these units and their tasks, the Army has allocated, exclusive of surface-to-air missile requirements, some $35.6 million, or 17.8 percent of the total request.

In the field of surface-to-air missile defense the Army has been assigned a broad and vital role in the maintenance of an effective air defense complex which will protect our industrial and population centers as well as our retaliatory forces and the field Army Forces at home and overseas. Effective and efficient fulfillment of this mission is vital to our survival. To reinforce its capabilities in this field the Army has devoted 61.5 percent or $123.1 million of the total authorization requested. A major portion of this requirement is devoted to research, development, and test facilities for the Nike-Zeus antiballistic missile defense system presently under development.

Without detracting from the urgent requirements of our deterrent and defense forces, I would like to mention the increasingly important contribution to the Army's capabilities that are inherent in Army aviation. The Army, within the limitations placed upon it, has developed a family of Army aircraft which fulfills missions of observation, airlift for troops and combat supplies in the battle zone, communications and battlefield surveillance and battlefield casualty evacuation. These missions are separate and distinct from the broader responsibilities of the Air Force. Additionally they are developing and testing new forms of aerial transport, including such projects as tiltwing aircraft and the flying jeep. For support of these activities and to provide the operational and maintenance facilities for aircraft now with the field forces, the Army has apportioned 3.8 percent or $7.7 million of the total requested in this bill.

Now departing for the moment from the military hardware aspects of this request, I want to address myself to another very important segment of this program dealing with the Army's pressing needs for family housing.

With regard to family housing to be authorized by this bill, it should be noted that although the Army has made good progress in providing adequate family housing during the last 3 years, the provision of additional adequate family housing is still one of the most pressing problems facing the military services today. I have taken a personal interest in the provision of family housing for our military people, and feel strongly that the Congress should leave nothing undone to provide satisfactory housing for all of our military families.

This bill provides new authorization for 7,399 units of title VIII Capehart housing, 338 units of appropriated fund housing in areas where Capehart or surplus commodity housing is not feasible, and 557 units of surplus commodity housing. In addition, the bill also provides for the continuation of prior authorization for 234 units of appropriated fund housing. In developing the family housing construction projects in this bill, full consideration was given to the use

of available adequate community support and private rental housing.

Let me remind you that the provision of adequate family housing ranks high among the motivating factors for the retention of trained military personnel in the Armed Forces, and in maintaining the high morale so necessary in the world of today.

This military public-works authorization program is only a small supporting authorization for the overall need of the Army. I would like to discuss briefly the crying need for modernization within our Army forces.

The United States emerged from World War II with the best equipped Army in the world. However, our Army has been greatly cut in strength and the majority of its major items of equipment have become obsolescent because of the lack of funds to modernize equipment and to replace wornout equipment. Today there is an urgent need for the modernization of the major items of Army equipment. General Taylor, the Army Chief of Staff, has testified that the limited funds for Army modernization is one of his principal reservations as to the adequacy of the defense budget for fiscal year 1960.

This need arises from two major circumstances: First, the rapid pace of technological advance over the past decade, and, second, the large, well-equipped, and modern ground forces of the Soviet Union and its satellites. Yesterday's weapons are today's second best, and tomorrow they may be obsolete. Recognizing this, the Soviet Union has been continuously modernizing its ground forces since the end of World War II. Their modernization program is the result of a thorough and well-conceived plan carried out without major deviation over the past decade. The program has been supported by a high and stable production rate that permits prompt replacement of normal losses and obsolescence, and transfer of increasing quantities of modern equipment of satellite armies and a smooth transition to wartime production.

The Soviet Army has been able to modernize and expand its weapons inventory. It has sufficient stocks of modern materiel to equip an active force of 175 divisions and to support it indefinitely in combat. Their equipment includes the means for fighting either nuclear or conventional wars anywhere on the Eurasian or Middle East land mass. Quality-wise they about equal our modern equipment; they lag behind us in some items; have drawn even in others; and surpass us in still others. Quantity-wise they overmatch us by a margin of 5 to 1.

Because of high and stable production rates, some major items of Soviet Army equipment have recently entered the second modernization cycle since World War II. For example, medium and heavy tanks, armored personnel carriers, trucks, and rocket launchers are now in the second round of modernization.

In the light of the Soviet progress, which is also being reflected in the growing materiel strength of their satellite countries, it is of paramount importance to modernize the equipment of the U.S. Army as rapidly as feasible. Because of reduced funds, U.S. Army weapons inventories have declined since the end of the Korean war and only limited improvements have been made in its quality.

The Army's concept of a versatile ground force that would be capable of delivering flexible and discriminating firepower upon hostile targets in limited or all-out war was built into its pentomic organization. Units organized under this concept, if adequately equipped, would comprise a highly mobile, flexible force capable of carrying out combat missions ranging from prompt suppression of local aggression to the conduct of major ground operations in a general thermonuclear war.

The field army of today requires continuous modernization of firepower, mobility, communications, and surveillance equipment, and of logistical support. General Hodes, the Army Commander in Europe, has testified that our ground combat forces urgently need the new medium tank with its heavier gun and diesel engine. They need the Hawk—the homing-all-the-way-killer-missile—which can engage and destroy supersonic aircraft whether flying at tree-top level or more than 6 miles above the ground. The Army has developed unmanned drones to obtain information on targets and movements deep within enemy territory and needs these drones so that it can effectively use such weapons as the Sergeant missile. For improved mobility, the Army must have the new M–113 aluminum armored personnel carrier with its greater speed and range. Also needed are greater quantities and improved models of such unglamorous but essential items as graders and bridge-building equipment to support combat operations.

The Army has developed a phased and reasonable plan for the modernization of its major equipment. As its highest priority objective, the Army proposes that equipment be modernized for its active divisions and for high priority reserve units to include sufficient materiel for combat support for the initial period of conflict, plus providing modern materiel in limited quantities to permit the continued training of the remainder of the reserve forces. To meet these objectives would require annual appropriations of about $2.8 billion over a 5-year period. This is approximately double the amount provided in the budget for fiscal year 1960. This increase would provide arms and equipment as modern as those anywhere in the world and in sufficient quantities to allow our Army to carry out its mission in limited or general war as part of our defense team and its partnership with our allies.

We cannot expect that this relatively modest additional investment will permit our small Army by itself to turn back the 175-division Soviet Army. We do not propose to match the Soviet forces quantitatively. A modern Army, together with the great tactical capabilities of our Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, and in concert with our allies, can act promptly to suppress limited aggression that might otherwise lead to general war. It can fill a dangerous gap in our diversified deterrent forces upon which we must depend to forestall all kinds of Communist aggression.

If any of my colleagues still feel that there is little need for ground forces in this age of nuclear weapons and jet proplusion, let me refer them to the testimony of our military leaders before Congressional committees. Virtually all our military leaders agree that limited war is the most likely form of future conflict. Both General Taylor and Admiral Burke have warned against overemphasis of the nuclear deterrent at the expense of other means of defense. The President himself has characterized an all-out nuclear war as unthinkable. We expect our allies, with our assistance, to maintain adequate ground forces and to provide modern equipment for them. Can we reasonably expect them to do this when we neglect our own Army? In fact, can we expect our alliances to survive at all in the face of Communist pressure if the only guarantee we can offer them is the assurance that, if the Communists initiate the destruction of western civilization, we will finish the job.

I have studied the Army's program and I feel that it is incumbent upon this Congress to provide the funds to support it. Our Army must have the best equipment this Nation can produce, thereby demonstrating for those who would destroy our way of life that this Nation is prepared to back up its commitments around the world and to deter or suppress aggression no matter where, when, or in what form its occurs.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, included in the bill before you is a line item for the construction of 156 family housing quarters at the U.S. Military Academy. I wish to speak in behalf of this project and its necessity for our country. Our first President in his eighth annual message to Congress in 1797 stated:

> The institution of a military academy is also recommended by cogent reasons. However pacific the general policy of a nation may be, it ought never to be without a stock of military knowledge for emergencies * * *. [The art of war] demands much previous study, and * * * [knowledge of that art] * * * in its most improved and perfect state is always of great moment in the security of a nation. * * * For this purpose an academy where a regular course of instruction is given is an * * * expedient which different nations have successfully employed.

I draw from this statement the phrase, "in its most improved and perfect state is always of great moment to the security of a nation," to emphasize that in the art of war, under present interpretation national survival, there is no second best. The item before you for consideration is not merely the construction of housing but is a most important link in the chain of events in the continuing struggle to maintain our position as a first-class power.

You will note that the construction cost of each unit will not exceed $19,800 or a total construction cost of $5,588,000, including costs of the houses, site preparation, paving and outside utilities. At first blush, this seems a costly endeavor indeed. On second look, however, an analysis of the project runs much deeper than these cold statistics indicate. We are faced with the continuing operation of an institution which has become associated over the past half century with the the successful execution of the complicated requirements of two world conflicts and a number of so-called limited engagements. We cannot afford to permit this historical symbol of military leadership to decline in the quality of its mission as the result of a substandard living condition for its instructor personnel. The problem of retaining qualified company grade officers in the Army is a real one. With ever-increasing living costs, a low salaried Army officer finds Army service an ever-increasing financial hardship. If West Point is to continue in the quality of its product, instructor personnel must at least be offered decent living accommodations.

The shortage in housing at the Academy is a serious one. The long range family housing requirement for company grade instructors at the Military Academy is 315 housing units. At present, a great majority of these officers are occupying inadequate quarters. Community support offers only 91 adequate quarters for the entire military complement of the Academy. To assist in alleviating this critical shortage of officer housing at the Academy, the Congress last year in the Military Construction Act of 1958 authorized the construction of 156 units of family quarters for company grade Officers under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act, commonly referred to as the Capehart program.

The Chief of Engineers, acting for the Department of the Army, proceeded to develop this authorized housing project, but soon found out that it was impossible to construct the Capehart housing because of cost limitations. It was not possible to construct housing of the authorized space and the desired standards within the statutory limitaion for Capehart housing of $16,500 per unit plus offsite utility costs of not to exceed $1,500 per unit. As you know, this $16,500 per unit limitation includes the cost of the house and all utilities within the boundaries of the project.

Various studies were made by the Army and the type of family housing that could be constructed using appropriated funds as an alternative to use of Capehart authorization. This idea was in accordance with the solution which the Congress had provided in other instances where it was impracticable to construct Capehart housing due to cost limitations. Studies considered row type housing, apartment type housing, and multi-family type housing. These studies showed without question that adherence to existing statutory cost limitations for company grade family housing units would result in a unit so small as to be unserviceable to the occupants and unacceptable to the Department of the Army as meeting neither space nor construction standards provided by current criteria. Consequently, the Army decided to request a project for 156 units of company grade quarters, to be constructed with appropriated funds, comparable in size and standards of construction to those constructed elsewhere in the United States under the provision of the Capehart Act. To accomplish this, special legislation is required to permit the exceeding of the statutory limitation of $15,400 per company grade unit. These units will not exceed the standards being used elsewhere in the United States. It is our hope that housing at West Point will merely be comparable in quality to housing generally provided at other Army installations.

This project for 156 units will consist of duplex and triplex two-story houses. the design for which will provide for reducing costs wherever possible. For example, construction will be concrete slab on grade—with no basement—a dry-wall type of interior construction, and individual hot air heating systems, certainly not the most elaborate of construction. In keeping with the standards desirable at the Military Academy, a national institution, which I am sure all of you will agree should not have its prestige lowered, the only concession proposed to the austere standards of construction is the use of brick exteriors and hardwood flooring.

Construction costs at West Point are considerably higher than the national average. In fact, the costs in that locality are about 10 percent higher than those prevailing in the New York City area and about 25 percent higher than the national average. This high cost is attributed to several reasons which become rather obvious. For example:

Local shortages of skilled labor requires the use of imported labor from distances up to 50 miles.

Coupled with the steep sloping terrain which varies from 10 to 15 percent in grade, rock outcroppings are encountered throughout the site, with the resulting costly site preparation. Blasting and drilling of dense rock is necessary in site and foundation preparations. Trenching through rock will be necessary for the extension of sewer and water lines, and even drilling in rock will be necessary for the extension and placement of the electrical and telephone poles. This work is extremely costly and is estimated to be approximately $1.6 million for clearing and grading of the site.

Water and sewer lines must each be extended for considerable distances to tie into existing systems.

Even the provision of walks, roads, parking and grassed areas which are necessary items in any housing development and cannot be deleted, are costly because of the rock condition.

Collections and disposal of surface runoff with the required storm drainage systems again is a costly item attributed to the rocky terrain.

In addition, the West Point area experiences a short summer construction period resulting in the added costs of winterization of facilities and loss in labor efficiency.

And inasmuch as all of these operations must be accomplished with the minimum interference to the training activities of the Cadet Corps, working and storage areas are somewhat restricted for the construction operations.

Let me again emphasize that it is not intended that these family housing units exceed the standards being used elsewhere in the United States, but that housing at the U.S. Military Academy should be comparable in quality to housing generally provided at other Army installations.

In summary, the basic problem facing us is simply this—the continual growth of our military posture in a time of startling scientific discoveries. Although the pace of our existence has quickened, one of the compelling reasons for the establishment of the Academy still exists. I speak of the "Ominous international political situation" so aptly depicted by Thomas Jefferson in 1801, the year before the establishment of the United States Military Academy. The spirit of Sylvanus Thayer, the father of the Military Academy, continues in the requirement for leadership integrated by excellence of character and excellence of knowledge. We cannot judge this requirement by cold fiscal calculation but must temper our decision to the realization that the quality of the product of the Academy is measured in direct proportion to the quality of the instructors which the Army may assign there.

HOUSING AT WEST POINT

One hundred and fifty-six houses at $19,800 per house, $3,089,000.

Five million five hundred eighty-eight thousand dollars plus includes 156 houses at $19,800 including all collateral costs.

Clearing, $81,000: The housing must be built in a heavily wooded area. Most trees must be removed and the ground otherwise prepared. This explains the unusual clearing cost.

COLLATERAL COSTS

Grading, $1,622,000: This is a large cost item because of the removal of 280,000 cu. yds. of boulder, ledge rock or other material at an estimated unit cost of $5.79 per cu. yd. This is a big cost item but through necessity the housing must be built in an area that is very steeply sloping and very rocky.

Roads, park, and recreational area, $303,000: (a) $57,500, access road exclusive of the shoulder construction; (b) $10,100, shoulder construction; (c) $111,600, interior roads; (d) $43,800, concrete curbs and gutters for roads; (e) $65,000, parking area, 5,460 square yards; (f) $15,000, grading and compacting of the recreational area.

This covers the access road into the housing area, the interior roads which have concrete curbs and gutters, parking areas, and a small amount of grading and compacting for a recreational area.

Drainage, $43,500: This includes normal drainage, storm drainage, ditching, and other drainage items which are the normal requirements for a housing area.

Water lines, $99,000: The water lines are normal in every respect. However, its installation in rock, as is necessary in this instance, causes the total installation cost to be greater.

Sanitary sewer lines, $71,000: These sanitary sewer lines are completely normal but, again, are somewhat more expensive because of the requirement of putting them in rock.

Electrical power and telephone, $187,500: (a) Electrical power, $92,000; (b) telephone, $95,000. These lines are not unusual except in one respect. There is an unusual distance involved because the source of power is a considerable distance away.

Final site improvement, $68,000: This is a normal part of a housing project and is unusual only in that a greater amount of topsoil will have to be imported into the area because of the rocky terrain.

Collateral equipment, $24,000: 156 ranges. Normal cost item.

Total cost, $5,588,000.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this bill. Quite naturally I have a very special interest in the Military Air Transport Service since the headquarters of this great organization is located at Scott Air Force Base which is within my congressional district.

Without in any way minimizing the other important authorities granted in this bill, I would like to call special attention to the construction authorizations contained in this bill for a highly important purpose. That purpose is to support the activities of the Military Air Transport Service which performs a vital and indispensable role in support of our strategic and tactical Air Force wartime operations and combat operations of the Army, Navy, and Marines, as well as the performance of military support operations in peacetime.

This bill provides construction authorizations of almost $5 million at MATS bases. An additional $7 million for direct support of MATS also is provided as part of the programs at the bases of other Air Force commands. In addition, authorization is contained in the bill for the construction of 600 units of family housing at 2 MATS bases utilizing private capital under the provisions of Title VIII of the National Housing Act. This construction alone, however, does not give a full picture of the extent of the MATS operations, for MATS operates from many far flung locations covering virtually every area of the world and jointly utilizes facilities at bases of other Air Force commands. The MATS construction authorizations will provide airfield, aircraft maintenance, and terminal facilities, navigational aids and essential personnel support facilities.

The Military Air Transport Service began the second decade of its history on June 1, 1958. Its primary mission is to maintain a state of readiness and capability to provide necessary airlift to meet wartime requirements of the Department of Defense. Although MATS has undergone major internal changes during its first 10 years, this mission has remained unchanged.

MATS is a modern up-to-date system. In the event of aggression, the ready and prompt ability to fulfill its mission may well be a vital factor in our success. Such a concept demands modernization with the latest technological advancements. Ten years of experience in this basic combat mission have enabled MATS to organize, to equip and to keep crews up to date and in step with the times. MATS today is flexible, adaptable, and modern.

MATS, a major Air Force command, was formed by consolidating two wartime air transport agenices—the Air Transport Command and the Naval Air Transport Service. MATS cut its teeth on the famous Berlin airlift. Both Air Force and Navy personnel and aircraft took part in the 14-month Operation Vittles to provide over 2 million tons of food, fuel, and medicine to Berlin and her beleaguered population of 2,500,000 people.

MATS has demonstrated its capabilities in other dramatic airlifts—the Pacific airlift in support of United Nations forces in Korea; the airlift of high-priority cargo and personnel during the construction of Thule Air Base in Greenland; Operation Wounded Warrior; airlift of United Nations troops and equipment to the Suez Canal Zone; and the Hungarian refugee airlift—Operation Safe Haven.

When the Korean war began in the summer of 1950, MATS was delivering approximately 70 tons of cargo to the Far East each month. Within 3 months, MATS transports were delivering up to 106 tons a day into Japan alone. The number of MATS Pacific airlift planes increased from 50 Douglas C–54's to a total of 160 MATS transports, plus 17 supplied by United Nations members and 66 leased from civil airlines. A total of 160,000 tons was airlifted in nearly 35,000 transpacific crossings before the Korean armistice was signed in 1953.

This Pacific airlift proved that air transport into a combat theater is not a one-way proposition. The return airlift was used to bring home combat casualties and other military patients as well as passengers from all services. Ninety percent of all evacuations of Korean wounded was by air. The result: Death rate from wounds was reduced from a World War II figure of 4 percent to lower than 2 percent. Medical air evacuation is now standard procedure.

In 1951 another rigorous test of MATS strategic airlift capability was the movement of personnel and materiel into Thule, Greenland. Moving bulldozers, power shovels, road graders, trucks, fuel, and, in one instance, a heavy crane, MATS demonstrated the potential of airlift into isolated areas. MATS has been credited with advancing the completion date of construction on the far northern base by a full year.

During 1954 MATS flew the longest aerial mercy mission in aviation history. More than 500 French troops wounded at Dien Bien Phu in Indochina were flown three-quarters of the way around the world in Operation Wounded Warrior.

In December 1956, the Hungarian refugee airlift Operation Safe Haven and the airlift of the U.N. police troops headed for the Suez area, once again proved that MATS was organized for D-day readiness. MATS flew 9,700 Hungarian refugees to America, including several thousand passengers carried by civil contract airlines.

MATS was called on to deliver supplies and equipment in support of Operation Deep Freeze—airlift support for Naval Task Force 43 in the Antarctic. Everything from the kitchen sink and a food mixer to a 3-ton Weasel and a 7-ton tractor was dropped at the Antarctic base. Despite some of the worst weather and radio blackout conditions ever recorded, the drops were remarkably successful.

Even more recent dramatic evidence of the importance and readiness of the MATS and the tactical troop carrier forces occurred in the last year during the periods of tension in Taiwan and Lebanon. MATS and troop carrier aircraft moved Army forces and supplies almost overnight during the Lebanon crisis. Within 73 hours after receiving orders to deploy, the first cargo aircraft was unloading its cargo of F–104 fighter planes and their pilots at Taiwan when the Chinese Communists attacked Quemoy last summer. Needless to say, this operation made a good impression on our friends, and perhaps an even stronger impression on the Chinese Communists.

The capability of airlift forces will expand during the coming year as aircraft modernization is applied.

MATS has entered the missile and space age with the latest in transport equipment. In 1948 the fleet was mainly composed of Douglas C–54 aircraft, but Operation Vittles graphically demonstrated the value of larger transports for strategic airlift. Over the years MATS has been gradually replacing obsolete aircraft with new planes designed for greater speed, range, and aircraft load—the Boeing C–97 Stratocruiser in 1949; the Douglas C–124 and R6D in 1951; the Douglas C–118 in 1952; the Lockheed R7V in 1953; the Lockheed C–121 in 1955; and in August 1957 MATS received its first swift, long-range turboprop—the Douglas C–133, which ushered in a new era in oceanic flight. The introduction of a jet cargo aircraft into the MATS force beginning in 1961 will increase total airlift capability.

While the command is perhaps best known for its airlift role, MATS is not solely an air transport organization. There are other equally vital services within MATS—the Air Force technical supporting services:

Air Weather Service—AWS—provides meteorological data on a global scale to U.S. Air Force and Army units. Beginning in 1917 as part of the Signal Corps, AWS now mans hundreds of weather stations in numerous countries throughout the world. A net of weather observation stations, both manned and automatic, is spread throughout the northern hemisphere. Also the Air Weather Service severe weather warning system,

developed largely to enable aircraft to be moved from the path of dangerous storms, has been effective, with some adaptations, in warning the civil population of storms. Weather reconnaissance has added much to our knowledge of hurricanes and typhoons.

Airways and Air Communication Service—AACS—transmits this mass of weather data. AACS also operates fixed aeronautical point-to-point and ground-to-air radio stations, airdrome control towers, electronic navigation aids, land-line facilities and teletype stations, cryptographic sections and message centers. AACS works in close cooperation, and jointly, with the FAA, in these vital aircraft and airspace control functions.

As the installing and operating agency for the USAF's Global Communications Systems, AACS transmits millions of messages monthly.

Another significant MATS service is STRATCOM, a worldwide communications network installed by AACS.

Air Rescue Service—ARS—is most dramatic of the MATS services. With its motto "That Others May Live," ARS was organized primarily to save the lives of Air Force crews involved in aircraft accidents. ARS humanitarian emergency work ranges around the world, covering both military and civilian crises.

ARS history is crowded with outstanding achievements. In recent months Rescue directed all operations by units of the Department of Defense during the two great New England floods and the floods in California. Rescue also has led the fight against floods in Japan, Italy, England, Holland, Mexico, Costa Rica, and at home in Kansas and Texas.

One of the most decorated and honored units of the Korean conflict was a detachment of the 3d Air Rescue Group, which completed 9,690 rescues within the combat area. Of this total, 996 United Nations personnel were rescued from behind the enemy lines. For this work the men of the 3d Air Rescue Group received the Air Force Association's flight trophy in 1953.

The Air Photographic and Charting Service—APCS—is the youngest member of MATS. Operating photographic and aerial mapping units throughout the world, this organization handles the overall photographic requirements of the Air Force.

MATS has an unparalleled safety record. In fact, military and civilian passengers on MATS scheduled flights are afforded worldwide accident insurance protection at regular commercial airline rates. In 1950 and again in 1954 MATS won the Daedalian Trophy for the lowest Air Force accident rate per 100,000 flying-hours. Transport operations achieved a rate of only two accidents per 100,000 flying-hours in 1954. In 1957 MATS had its lowest accident rate, with and overall rate of 3.9 per 100,000 flight-hours and 1.08 per 100,000 hours in transport operations.

Specialized aircraft development, such safety devices as antiskid brakes and anticollision lights, improvements in navigational aids, communications techniques, and other equipment, have all contributed to this outstanding record.

This is the Military Air Transport Service. Its transport divisions and diversified support services are potent factors in the maintenance of world peace.

Since October 1957 MATS has operated and controlled this vast and important military system from headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, near Belleville, Ill. This is one of the major installations of today's Air Force, and it is the home of other important Air Force activities, in addition to MATS Headquarters. These include a MATS transport squadron, an Air Training Command technical training group, and an Air Force Reserve troop-carrier squadron. Over 4,000 military personnel are stationed at this base, and it employs about 2,500 civilian workers.

Approximately $59 million have been invested to date for facilities at Scott Air Force Base. Two hundred and fifty-three thousand dollars for additional construction at Scott is contained in the authorization bill under consideration today, and the Air Force plans additional investments in future years to expand and improve the existing facilities.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say today I hope will not be considered by the distinguished chairman and the members of the Committee on Armed Services as being criticism. If it is in the nature of criticism, it is constructive criticism. Looking over the proposed expenditures for construction and maintenance, and what have you, I note that little, if any, attention has been given by the committee to favor areas and States within our Nation that have tremendous unemployment at the present time. It is significant that those various States have little, if anything, in this bill that would help the unemployment situation.

I do want to digress long enough to express my thanks to the committee for continuing the appropriation for the only project that West Virginia has in the whole military setup, naval and otherwise. It is a naval installation at Sugar Grove, W. Va. I am deeply thankful that the committee is continuing to provide moneys or authorizing moneys to continue with the construction of this installation.

I might say to my distinguished chairman that after the little hassle we had on the floor here 3 or 4 years ago, I want to again take this opportunity to thank him, because he said then, "If the gentleman from West Virginia will keep quiet, we will give him some kind of an installation," and they did. But, it is only 6 miles from the West Virginia border; nevertheless it is in West Virginia.

I want to take this time to call the attention of the committee to a situation in West Virginia that needs the attention of the Committee on Armed Services. We have, at South Charleston, W. Va., an installation known as the Naval Armor Plate Plant. It was a World War I facility that cost the Government $134 million initially. It lay dormant between World War I and the outbreak of World War II. Then they came along in World War II and expended an additional $50 million for additional buildings. The Carnegie Steel Co. took it over and operated it and made all kinds of war material. We constructed small PT boats there and small destroyers. We manufactured all kinds of small arms; I forget what the bore of the cannons was that were made there. But, after World War II ended again it was revived and some of the buildings used and contracts let for Government production of military and naval equipment. Since the Korean war difficulties arose, it is being maintained by the Federal Government at a tremendous cost.

Inquiry at the Bureau of Naval Operations disclose an annual maintenance and upkeep cost of $535,000, exclusive of salaries of naval personnel. There are 8 naval officers and 306 civilians looking after the maintenance and storage.

We have this situation to contend with. They were so anxious to get that fine location of level land—most of it is as level as the prairie land of Kansas—that they entered into an agreement with the people from whom they bought it that any time they ceased to use it for defense purposes, title would revert back to the people. Here you have millions of dollars of Government money tied up. They do not want to sell it. The fact of the matter is, they cannot sell it. It is costing thousands upon thousands of dollars annually for maintenance purposes, because they keep it ready to go at any time. I am wondering, in view of the unemployment situation we have there, why there is not some activity underway at this time at that particular plant. With that much of a Government investment, why not make some use of this plant?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my good friend from West Virginia that I am quite familiar with this installation. As a matter of fact, back in 1916 or 1917 I was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs when we authorized it. Ever since that time I have been resisting various efforts, some led by the community, some led by the State, to dispose of this piece of property. I do not think it should be disposed of. I think it should be utilized. I pledge the gentleman I shall continue to do everything I possibly can, and with his cooperation I hope we may be able to find a way in which it can be utilized, put in operation as an active Government installation.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely essential that we provide properly for the defense of the United States. That includes the necessary military installations. However, I also feel that it is equally important to the defense of the United States that we properly utilize our dollars and our financial resources. Of course, it is most important that when we spend $3 for defense installations that we do not get only $2 of value. I am sure that the committee has in-

vestigated all of these items pretty well, but I should like in connection with one of them to get a little more information. This is in connection with Fort Sill in Oklahoma where they call for operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities in the amount of $5,337,000. I would like to know just what some of the operational and training facilities are.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the distinguished gentleman from the icebound regions of Vermont has drifted down to Fort Sill in Oklahoma. It is refreshing to get his question, and I am happy to try to give him the full information. This provides an authorization of $5,337,000, and it is broken down in this way: A taxiway, compass swinging base, runway approach lighting, ordnance support battlian facilities for special weapons, three missile ground handling equipment buildings, three missile maintenance equipment shops and facilities.

There are also hardstand, missile maintenance equipment shops and facilities, a motor maintenance shop, and a motor park. Which one of these items is the gentleman inquiring about?

Mr. MEYER. In connection with the expenditure of these funds for these missile installations, will they require the purchase of any additional land in the future?

Mr. VINSON. I am quite familiar with all the land controversy down there. I am glad to say there is nothing in this bill or nothing contemplated in this bill right now with respect to expanding the land facilities at Fort Sill.

Mr. MEYER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Then I want to mention another item. Is there anything in this bill that might arise in the future about the following matter? Up in Vermont on our highest mountain, one of our great scenic areas, Mount Mansfield, there was a demand one time that they would need to use that mountain top for certain installations for observation purposes. When local objections were made, shortly thereafter they said that a new development in the missile field would no longer require the use of this area. Is there anything of that type injected into this bill?

Mr. VINSON. I want to say to my good friend that his question is so detailed I am not in a position to answer it. I just could not answer that kind of question. I know there is nothing in the bill relating to it. Of course, I cannot tell what is going to be running through the minds of the planners in the days to come. I have to deal with it as I come to the bridge. It is not involved in this bill at all now. I am sorry I cannot help the gentleman there today.

Mr. MEYER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, within the last year there has been located in the Arlington Towers Apartments, in Virginia within a stone's throw of the Pentagon, an institution called the Military Training Institute. The contract for the operation of the Military Training Institute was farmed out to a psychology professor who has organized what is called the American Institute for Research.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say to my good friend there is not a line in this bill dealing with that subject. I know what is running through the mind of the gentleman. That is a school where men are trained for military aid work overseas.

Mr. GROSS. The school is designed to instruct officers in the military assistance program overseas.

Mr. VINSON. The State Department has a large voice in that military assistance. There is not a thing in this bill about it.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to hear the gentleman say that this bill carries no money for the operation of that Military Training Institute.

Mr. VINSON. When the Foreign Affairs Committee brings in its bill it will have jurisdiction of that. We do not.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. VINSON. We have enough trouble on our hands without going into that.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the chairman that I think he could very well look into this kind of operation, where an absentee operator, a psychology professor at Pittsburgh, Pa., gets a cost plus a 6 percent fee contract to operate a military training institute. The function of the Army in peacetime is training. I believe the chairman will agree with me that it is their function in peacetime. Retired military personnel are being used in this school yet this former professor has a cost plus a 6 percent fee for the operation in some of the most expensive property in the District of Columbia area, all at taxpayer expense.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that I respect his remarks and will transmit them to the proper department. I am grateful to him for bringing it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman can help me with another question: What has been the fate of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot at Houston, Tex., which was an item quite in controversy here a year ago when a bill similar to this came before the House?

Mr. VINSON. I have a letter from Secretary McElroy dated March 6, 1959. It reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, March 6, 1959.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the provisions of section 109, Public Law 85–685, I have had a thorough study made regarding the need for the Department of Defense to retain the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot.

As a result of my review of this study, I find that disposal of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot and its outloading terminal will not be inimical to the national security. This study has also revealed that there is no need for the construction of a replacement ammunition outloading terminal at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala.

I have advised the Secretary of the Army of my findings and requested him to initiate appropriate action with the General Services Administration for the disposal of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot in accordance with the provisions of section 109 of Public Law 85–685.

Sincerely,

NEIL MCELROY.

I think this letter answers the inquiry of the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I want to thank the gentleman for reading the letter into the RECORD because I have had some difficulty in getting informaion from the Pentagon on this particular subject. So, as I understand it now, this ordnance depot which is probably the best in the United States of America, which has deep sea loading facilities, being located on the ship channel just south of Houston, Tex., whose proud boast is "where 22 railroads meet the sea". In other words, it has easy access to railroad transportation to any point in the continental United States. It offers sea transportation of ammunition anywhere throughout the world, and it is now going to be disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank both of my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, this ordnance depot is now to be disposed of. It is an installation comprising 5,000 acres of land with 18 miles of railroad trackage and with miles upon miles of all-weather roads. Not more than a year ago, we were told that this ordnance depot held nearly 100 thousand tons of ammunition with a value of $120 million and yet, this is to be disposed of. Is that the understanding?

Mr. VINSON. That is the decision of the Secretary based upon the law. I say to my good friend, I have confidence in the judgment of the Secretary. The Secretary was directed to make a study. He did make a study. He appointed qualified people. He advised the Committee on Armed Services that in accordance with the law, he found it was all right to dispose of this installation—even to the extent that there is no need and no necessity of building a comparable one in Alabama.

Mr. GROSS. And, yet, only a year ago, Mr. Chairman—only a year ago—the Department of the Army, this same Defense Department, appeared before the gentleman's committee and said that this ordnance depot must be retained; that it was necessary to the defense and security of this country.

Mr. VINSON. You must bear in mind—and this statement is one that will be made often when it comes to a question of a change of opinion or a change in what we are doing—oftentimes new type of weapons that come into existence change our plans. If I may, I would like to make this statement and I will yield the gentleman

additional time, if he wants it, but I pointed out previously that in a great many of these construction programs, millions and millions of dollars today are being spent based upon the use of man-operated airplanes. These in the course of time are going to fade away. We are hoping that when the missile era arrives—and we are getting closer and closer to it every day—that we can utilize some of these facilities that we are providing for today. Now, the same thing applies with reference to ammunition depots. There is no need and no necessity today to honeycomb the Nation with ammunition depots when we know that in the future we will not have to have the type of ammunition that we have to have today.

Mr. GROSS. To me this is a strange proceeding, that this splendid depot in Texas, just south of Houston, Tex., should be the first selected to go, under the conditions set forth.

Mr. VINSON. We have to start somewhere. I have confidence in the judgment of the Secretary of Defense. I am supporting his judgment, and I think he reached the right decision in regard to it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois who has fought hard to retain this facility.

Mr. ARENDS. This became quite a controversial question last year in which I took part. Let me say that within the recent year surveys and studies have been made of the whole situation. We will try to find out all the necessary information in the committee later on.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. There was submitted to the Armed Services Committee a few days ago for our consideration what is known as a real estate disposal project. There will again be a vote before this is finally disposed of.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure there will be. And I hope the chairman of the committee will give a full and fair hearing.

Mr. VINSON. I want the committee to understand this: On three separate occasions there has been a yea-and-nay roll call vote. On the first occasion the vote was 202 to 179. On another it was 376 to 2. On the conference report it was 256 to 135. On three separate occasions the issue has been joined and the House has approved of what the Secretary has now done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LAUGHLIN AND GOODFELLOW AIR FORCE BASES

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to two Air Force installations which, while not represented by substantial new construction authorization in this bill, are vital installations in the Air Force, serving highly essential functions.

One of these installations is Laughlin Air Force Base, located at Del Rio, Tex. This base was dedicated in 1943 and named in honor of Lt. Jack Thomas Laughlin who was born in Del Rio, Tex., and graduated from the University of Texas. Lieutenant Laughlin served nobly with the Air Corps in defense of his country until he was killed in combat in January 1942 while flying a B–17 mission over Java. He was the first World War II pilot casualty from Del Rio, Tex.

Laughlin Air Force Base now is one of the major installations of the Strategic Air Command. This is a highly appropriate mission for the base following its earlier illustrious accomplishments as an advanced flying school for pilot training. Throughout World War II, Laughlin Air Force Base, then known as Laughlin Army Air Field, trained and sent to war theaters more than 2,200 B–26 pilots. Again, during the Korean conflict, Laughlin Air Force Base played a significant role in the necessarily increased pilot training program by the conduct of training in transition to the then new jet aircraft and gunnery.

Now as a SAC base, Laughlin is the home and operating base of a strategic reconnaissance wing of the Strategic Air Command. In that capacity, it plays a tremendously important role in the immense capabilities of the Strategic Air Command which today provides the primary deterrence to an aggression against this country.

The deterrent capability of the Strategic Air Command hinges mainly on the ability of SAC to retaliate with overwhelming force and annihilate any aggressor. This capability results from SAC's superior degree of efficiency and readiness which gives it the ability to keep a significant portion of its strike force alive and respond instantly even in the face of a massive surprise attack.

A key element in the attainment and continuance of this vital SAC deterrent capability are the bases in being from which the SAC reconnaissance and bomber units operate. As part of this key element, Laughlin Air Force Base, with its over 3,000 military personnel and 300 civilian employees, is admirably suited for its prominent and important contribution to the defense of our country.

The other installation of which I wish to speak is Goodfellow Air Force Base, which is near San Angelo in Tom Green County, Tex. This base was named for Lt. John J. Goodfellow, Jr., of San Angelo, who was killed in fighter combat in France in 1918.

Goodfellow Air Force Base was initially occupied in 1941 and, except for a brief inactive period following World War II, served until last year in a capacity, similar to Laughlin Air Force Base, of pilot flight training by the Air Training Command. On July 1, 1958, the base was transferred to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Air Force Security Service to use for highly specialized training of personnel who perform extremely essential communications-electronics intelligence and communications security functions in support of Air Force and other defense agency activities. Under its current utilization, over 2,000 military personnel, principally highly specialized technicians, will work or receive training, aided and supported by approximately 400 civilian employees.

In view of the specialized nature and critical importance of the function being performed by Goodfellow Air Force Base, it also takes a rightful place as one of the principal military installations making a vital contribution to national defense.

Though not among the largest installations in the Military Establishment, the nature and importance of the activities performed at Laughlin Air Force Base and Goodfellow Air Force Base, and the high quality of that performance, are such that the people of Texas and the rest of the Nation can be justifiably proud.

Mr. VINSON. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Technical Services Facilities

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,387,000.

Savannah Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $3,230,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,866,000.

Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina: Family housing, $251,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.

Field Forces Facilities

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,747,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facility, $1,228,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $2,662,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilites, $7,260,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $593,000.

Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Ord, California: Supply facilities, $85,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.

Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $29,026,000.

Outside the United States

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259,000.

Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.

Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $83,330,000.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units, and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.
Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.
Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.
Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.
Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.
Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.
Fort Ord, California, 500 units.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

Outside the United States

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,497,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

Aviation Facilities

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,897,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,940,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jerscy: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,196,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,050,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn. New York: Administrativc facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Basc, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

Medical Facilities

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London. Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

Outside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $11,934,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $781,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $21,765,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5 million: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 250 units.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000". (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Mem-

phis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", $48,389,000", and "$337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or tempoary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,078,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $225,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

Air Materiel Command

Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and suppdy facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,303,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and communty facilities, $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia; Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,458,000.

Air Research and Development Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $542,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $2,258,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,598,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,741,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,193,000.

Air University

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $21,357,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

Strategic Air Command

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, $569,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,075,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,260,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth, Air Force Base, Rapid City South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $1,461,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,711,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $1,066,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

Offut Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,505,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.

Tactical Air Command

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $2,222,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $672,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $3,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilitics, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $715,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilitics, utilities, and real estate, $77,405,000.

Outside the United States

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,249,000.

Pacific Air Forces

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,352,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Supply facilities, and utilities, $374,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $8,590,000.

United States Security Service

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $443,541,000.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen recearch and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate ad House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwater RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified locations, 343 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 300 units.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 350 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 300 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.
Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.
Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 470 units.
Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.
Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 285 units.
K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 260 units.
Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units,
Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.
Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.
Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 320 units.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 550 units.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 300 units.
Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 260 units.
Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.
Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 400 units.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000."

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000" and "$607,725,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85–685, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000",

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$452,161,000" and "$952,415,000", inserting in place thereof "$544,239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

General Provisions

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $86,505,000; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $83,330,000; section 103, $5,000,000; or a total of $199,045,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $113,253,000; outside the United States, $42,265,000; section 202, $21,765,000; section 203, $5,000,000; or a total of $182,283,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $295,100,000; outside the United States, $65,081,000; section 302, $443,541,000; section 303, $5,000,000; or a total of $808,722,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another Department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended;

(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 507 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I section 101, of the Act of Augst 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended.

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson, South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326).

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-

tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 410. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 411. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 412. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78) is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000."

SEC. 413. Titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

Reserve forces facilities

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

Army Reserve

Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.

Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.

Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.

Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.

Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.

Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.

Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.

Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.

Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.

Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.

Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.

East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.

El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.

Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.

Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.

Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.

Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.

Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Meadeville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.

Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.

Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.

New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.

Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.

Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.

Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.

Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,009.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.

San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.

San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.

San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.

Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.

Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.

Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.

Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.

Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor additions. $1,788,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.

Army National Guard of the United States

(Armory)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.

Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.

Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.

Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.

Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.
Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.
Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.
Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.
Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.
Colville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.
Dermott, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.
Dover, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.
Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.
Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.
Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.
Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.
Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
Heber Springs, Arkansas: Training facilities, $90,000.
Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.
Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.
Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.
Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.
Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.
Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.
Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.
Miiwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.
Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.
Orlean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.
Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.
Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.
Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.
Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.
Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Riverdale, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.
Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.
Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.
Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.
Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.
San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.
Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.
Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.
Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.
Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

Army National Guard of the United States
(Nonarmory)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.
Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.
Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.
Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.
Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

Naval Reserve (Aviation)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.
Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.
Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.
Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.
Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.
Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.
Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

Naval Reserve (Surface)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

Marine Corps Reserve (Ground)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.
Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.
Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.
Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

Air Force Reserve

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities and operational facilities, $364,000.
Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.
Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.
General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.
O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.
Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.
Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.
Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and troop housing, $188,000.

Air National Guard of the United States

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.
New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.
Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.
Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Utilities and ground improvements, $4,963,000.
Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $426,000.
Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.
Camp Williams, Camp Dougias, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.
Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.
Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.
Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.
Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.
Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.
Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.
Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $250,000.
Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.
Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.
Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.
Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,825,000.
Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $192,000.
San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.
Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.
Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.
Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.
Will Rogers Field, Okiahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the netx law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided*, That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85-685, is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIA-

TION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85-685, is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85-685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85-685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 3 of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."

"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."

"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85-685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000;" and by striking out in clause (2)(b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place thereof "$12,446,000;" and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,702,000".

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army Reserve, $20,748,000;

(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,451,000;

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, $15,536,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1)(a), (1)(b), (2), (3)(a), and (3)(b) of section 504, respectively.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959."

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site for a United States Army Reserve Center: *Provided,* That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.

SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts except that any moneys received under section 1(2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 2, line 11, strike "Savannah" and insert in lieu thereof "Savanna".

Page 24, line 10, strike "$225,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$255,000".

Page 32, line 12, strike "Offut" and insert in lieu thereof "Offutt".

Page 40, following line 6, insert a new item as follows:

"Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units."

Page 69, line 6, strike "section 1" and insert in lieu thereof "section 601".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 20, line 11, strike "250 units" and insert in lieu thereof "450 units".

On page 40, following line 3, insert:

"Loring Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units."

On page 40, following line 9, insert:

"Travis Air Force Base, California, 600 units."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as I stated to the committee when I was presenting the bill, I offer this amendment.

These Capehart houses have all been approved by the President and would have been in the bill had they been passed on by the Budget prior to the time the Armed Forces Committee reported its bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENDS: On page 39, following line 12, insert a new item as follows:

"Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 180 units."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to say that Chanute Air Force Base is one of the major Air Force technical training schools.

I offer this amendment because the Air Force has a firm provable requirement for an additional 180 family housing units at Chanute Air Force Base.

Chanute is located adjacent to the town of Rantoul, Ill., which has a population—within the commutable area—of approximately 15,000 people.

The Air Force housing requirement is based on the missions at the end of fiscal year 1962. At that time, there will be approximately 600 officers and 5,400 airmen assigned to the base. Of these, 440 officers and 1,920 airmen—total 2,360—personnel will be authorized family housing. In addition, there will be a requirement for approximately 890 junior grade airmen for whom the Air Force is not authorized to provide housing.

Offsetting this requirement are 1,780 available, adequate housing units, consisting of 78 public quarters, 450 Capehart units—under construction—800 Wherry units, and 452 adequate privately owned units. This leaves a deficit of 580 units. Against this deficit the Air Force proposes to construct the 180 additional units.

Construction of the 180 units will provide onbase housing for only 64 percent of the authorized requirement, and will provide adequate housing, including the private rentals, for only 83 percent of those authorized housing.

I want to draw particular attention to the fact that this project has been approved by the Department of Defense

and has been certified by the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly familiar with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois; I have examined it; I am acquainted with the facts. This item is of high priority. They have need for 2,360 units; they have available 1,780 units. There is a deficit of 580 units.

This amendment provides for only 180.

I think we would be warranted in trying to provide more.

I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN: Page 11, between lines 12 and 13, under the heading "Fleet Base Facilities", insert:

"Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities, $701,000".

Page 42, lines 19 and 20, strike "$113,253,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$113,954,000".

Page 42, line 22, strike "$182,283,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$182,984,000".

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is simply stated as being to provide a facility necessary to prevent the discharge in San Francisco Bay of raw, untreated sewage. At the present time naval facilities on Treasure Island and the Yerba Buena Island are discharging raw sewage into the bay.

On October 21, 1954, the California Regional Water Pollution Control Board of Region 2 established a resolution which stated that a condition of pollution and nuisance existed as a result of untreated sewage being discharged into San Francisco Bay from the shore facilities of the U.S. Navy at Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that this resolution has the force and effect of law in California. The effect of this disposal into San Francisco Bay today has become increasingly inimical to the welfare of the people of the State of California.

Executive Order No. 10014, dated November 3, 1948, requires cooperation and participation of the Federal Government in local pollution abatement programs. My amendment is in direct consonance with that Executive order and would be a major step forward in correcting a most serious situation in San Francisco Harbor.

It is my understanding that this item, which would cost $701,000, is very high on the Navy's priority list but fell out of the current program which we are considering today at the last moment.

This type of facility is sometimes considered by the military to be less attractive than some operational facilities. While I can understand the views of the military in this respect, I feel that this does constitute a sufficiently important item to warrant the full approval of this House.

Let me repeat, this is a high-priority item in the Navy's own program, but as it fell out of the program this year, so might it fall out again next year in competition with other apparently more attractive military requirements.

I most sincerely urge favorable consideration of this amendment as a truly necessary and even vital requirement for the San Francisco Bay area.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of examining this amendment. I know it is very high on the priority list and the objective is well founded. No community in America wants raw sewage flowing into its waterways. There is a large naval installation out there at Treasure Island that is polluting the water of San Francisco Bay.

This is an item that would increase the appropriation or authorization by $701,000. We reduced this bill $109 million under the budget estimate. If we accept this amendment then it will bring about a permanent reduction in the authorization to $108,546,000.

We have already done a magnificent job on this bill, so it will not hurt to accept this amendment providing for $701,000 additional.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether there is any money in this bill for the Air Force Academy or not.

Mr. VINSON. I can see that the gentleman and I are thinking alike. There is not one dollar in here for the Air Force Academy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is an item or two that I think should be called to the attention of the House in connection with what is going on at the Air Force Academy. I find in a report issued by the Comptroller General of the United States in February 1959, which is not too long ago, a statement by a Member of the Senate, to be found on page 2646 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1954, as follows:

I may say that the top limit of the original appropriation requested for the Air Force Academy was $146 million. The committee voted to make the limit $126 million instead of the $146 million without serious objection on the part of the Air Force.

Turning to the report that was issued in February of this year by the General Accounting Office we find that the total estimated cost of establishing, constructing, and equipping the Air Force Academy, exclusive of aircraft, is shown on page 18.

I read from the summarization:

The recorded Air Force cost as adjusted as of August 31, 1958, $176,691,505.

Related costs (Capehart housing and Federal grants for school construction), $20,860,162.

Additional planned requirements (approved and unapproved), $72,261,970.

That is a total of $269,813,637 as compared with the statement to be found in the RECORD on March 8, 1954, of an estimated cost of $126 million.

Now, then, on page 10 of this report from the General Accounting Office I find this:

The cost of construction items amounting to $3,479,866 was improperly charged to other appropriations. As a result of congressional hearings in June 1958, adjustments were made by the Air Force for $938,068. We intend to inform the Secretary of the Air Force that additional adjustments of $2,541,798 should be made.

And the report goes on to list the adjustments that must be made including $938,068.

Here are a few items:

Removal of slash and debris, $108,064.

Bowling alleys—social center, $94,052.

Bowling alleys—base exchange, $97,160.

Swimming pool dividers, $171,112.

Valet units—cadet quarters, $364,798.

Medicine cabinets—cadet quarters, $102,882.

I do not know what the medicine cabinets are, but I assume they are the kind of cabinets you have in the bathroom in your home or apartment. I do not know what else they could be. But the amount is $102,882.

Now, I wonder when somebody is going to put the brake on this Air Force Academy construction program. Something needs to be done, and badly.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I am happy to say that we already have put the brakes on. The figure in the organize law was $126 million. By two or three amendments we raised the cost to about $140 million, total construction. And, there is not $1 in this bill for the Academy. So, we have in that way conformed with the Comptroller's report. I have it here, and I am glad the gentleman is reading it and will continue to read it on some other of there items. It is very illuminating. So, rest assured that there is not 1 penny in this bill today for the Air Force Academy. The brakes are on now.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 55, after line 7 and before line 8, insert the following:

"San Jose, California: Parking lot and drill grounds, $1."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have had the privilege of examining this amendment. It is an exchange of property without cost to the Government; almost to the foot an equal exchange of property. I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under con-

sideration the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 245, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were yeas 377, nays 7, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—377

Abbitt	Cahill	Fountain
Abernethy	Canfield	Frazier
Adair	Cannon	Frelinghuysen
Addonizio	Carter	Friedel
Albert	Casey	Fulton
Alexander	Cederberg	Gallagher
Alger	Chamberlain	Garmatz
Allen	Cheif	Gary
Anderson, Mont.	Chenoweth	Gathings
	Chiperfield	Gavin
Andrews	Church	George
Anfuso	Clark	Glenn
Arends	Coad	Granahan
Ashley	Coffin	Grant
Ashmore	Cohelan	Gray
Aspinall	Collier	Green, Oreg.
Auchincloss	Colmer	Green, Pa.
Avery	Conte	Griffin
Ayres	Cook	Griffiths
Bailey	Cooley	Gross
Baker	Corbett	Gubser
Baldwin	Cunningham	Hagen
Barden	Curtin	Haley
Barr	Curtis, Mass.	Hall
Barrett	Curtis, Mo.	Halleck
Barry	Dague	Halpern
Bass, N.H.	Daniels	Hardy
Bass, Tenn.	Davis, Ga.	Hargis
Bates	Dawson	Harmon
Becker	Delaney	Harris
Beckworth	Denton	Harrison
Belcher	Derounian	Healey
Bennett, Fla.	Derwinski	Hébert
Bennett, Mich.	Devine	Hemphill
Bentley	Dingell	Henderson
Berry	Dixon	Herlong
Betts	Dollinger	Hess
Blatnik	Donohue	Hiestand
Blitch	Dooley	Hoeven
Boggs	Dorn, N.Y.	Hoffman, Ill.
Boland	Dorn, S.C.	Hoffman, Mich.
Bolling	Dowdy	Hogan
Bolton	Downing	Holifield
Bonner	Doyle	Holt
Bosch	Duiski	Holtzman
Bow	Durham	Horan
Boykin	Dwyer	Hosmer
Boyle	Edmondson	Huddleston
Brademas	Elliott	Hull
Bray	Everett	Ikard
Breeding	Evins	Irwin
Brewster	Fallon	Jarman
Brock	Farbstein	Jennings
Brooks, La.	Fascell	Jensen
Brooks, Tex.	Felghan	Johansen
Broomfield	Fenton	Johnson, Calif.
Brown, Ga.	Fino	Johnson, Colo.
Brown, Ohio	Fisher	Johnson, Md.
Broyhill	Flood	Johnson, Wis.
Budge	Flynn	Jonas
Burdick	Flynt	Jones, Ala.
Burke, Ky.	Fogarty	Jones, Mo.
Burke, Mass.	Foley	Judd
Burleson	Forand	Karsten
Bush	Ford	Karth
Byrne, Pa.	Forrester	Kasem
Kastenmeier	Moore	Schenck
Kearns	Moorhead	Scherer
Kee	Morgan	Schwengel
Keith	Morris, N. Mex.	Seiden
Kelly	Morris, Okla.	Shelley
Keogh	Moss	Sheppard
Kilburn	Mumma	Shipley
Kilday	Murphy	Short
Kilgore	Murray	Sikes
King, Calif.	Natcher	Siler
King, Utah	Nelsen	Simpson, Ill.
Kirwan	Nix	Sisk
Kitchin	Norrell	Slack
Kluczynski	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Calif.
Knox	O'Brien, N.Y.	Smith, Iowa
Kowalski	O'Hara, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Lafore	O'Hara, Mich.	Smith, Miss.
Landrum	O'Neill	Smith, Va.
Lane	Oliver	Spence
Langen	Osmers	Springer
Lankford	Ostertag	Staggers
Latta	Passman	Steed
Lennon	Patman	Stratton
Lesinski	Pelly	Taber
Levering	Perkins	Taylor
Libonati	Pfost	Teague, Calif.
Lindsay	Philbin	Thomas
Lipscomb	Pillion	Thompson, La.
Loser	Pirnie	Thompson, N.J.
McCormack	Poage	Thomson, Wyo.
McCulloch	Poff	Thornberry
McDonough	Porter	Toll
McDowell	Preston	Tollefson
McFall	Price	Trimble
McGinley	Prokop	Tuck
McGovern	Pucinski	Ullman
McIntire	Quie	Utt
McMillan	Rabaut	Vanik
McSween	Rains	Van Zandt
Macdonald	Randall	Vinson
Machrowicz	Ray	Wainwright
Mack, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.	Wallhauser
Mack, Wash.	Rees, Kans.	Walter
Madden	Reuss	Wampler
Magnuson	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
Mahon	Riehlman	Weaver
Mailliard	Riley	Weis
Marshall	Rivers, Alaska	Westland
Martin	Rivers, S.C.	Wharton
Matthews	Roberts	Widnall
May	Robison	Wier
Metcalf	Rodino	Willis
Michel	Rogers, Colo.	Withrow
Miller, Clement W.	Rogers, Fla.	Wright
	Rogers, Mass.	Yates
Miller, N.Y.	Rogers, Tex.	Young
Milliken	Rooney	Younger
Mills	Roosevelt	Zablocki
Minshall	Rutherford	Zelenko
Monagan	St. George	
Montoya	Saylor	

NAYS—7

Byrnes, Wis.	Mason	O'Konski
Jackson	Meyer	Sullivan
Laird		

NOT VOTING—50

Alford	Holland	Santangelo
Anderson, Minn.	Meader	Saund
	Merrow	Scott
Baring	Miller, George P.	Simpson, Pa.
Baumhart		Stubblefield
Bowles	Mitchell	Teague, Tex.
Brown, Mo.	Moeller	Telier
Buckley	Morrison	Thompson, Tex.
Carnahan	Moulder	Udall
Celler	Multer	Van Pelt
Cramer	Norblad	Whitener
Daddario	Pilcher	Whitten
Davis, Tenn.	Polk	Williams
Dent	Powell	Wilson
Diggs	Quigley	Winstead
Giaimo	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wolf
Hays	Rostenkowski	
Hechler	Roush	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Bowles with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no further program for the balance of this week. We are all caught up with rules reported out by the Rules Committee.

As the Rules Committee failed to report out a rule today on the housing bill, we will, of course, have to wait until calm judgment reconsiders and brings out a rule. We are all caught up.

I have no legislative program to announce for next week.

Starting Wednesday evening, of course, begin the holy days of our friends of the Jewish faith. That means there would be legislation only on Monday and Tuesday. So if the Rules Committee should meet Monday—I have no knowledge that they will—but if they should I would feel under all the circumstances that I should not program legislation for next week.

So there is no further program for the rest of the week and there is no program for next week except on Monday the calls of bills on the Consent Calendar and on Tuesday the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me, and I think it is a very good one, that we call bills on both the Consent and Private Calendars on Monday next. So if the gentleman from Indiana has no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the call of bills on the Private Calendar for Tuesday next may take place on Monday next.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

H. R. 5074

AN ACT

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5674

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 17 (legislative day, APRIL 15), 1959
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,387,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $3,230,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,866,000.

Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina: Family housing, $251,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,747,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facility, $1,228,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $2,662,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,260,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $593,000.

Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Ord, California: Supply facilities, $85,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.

Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $29,026,000:

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259.000.

Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.

Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $83,330,000.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may estab-

lish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Commit-

tees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.

Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.

Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.

Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.

Fort Ord, California, 500 units.

Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,497,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities, $701,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Flor-

ida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,897,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,940,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,196,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,050,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real Estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITES

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $11,934,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $781,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $21,765,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved produc-

tion schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 450 units.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000". (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-

tion 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES

(Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and $337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site prepa-

ration, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,078,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $255,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,303,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,458,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $542,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:

Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $2,258,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,598,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,741,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,193,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $21,357,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, $569,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,075,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,260,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $1,461,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,711,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $1,066,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,505,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $2,222,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $672,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $3,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $715,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $77,405,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,249,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,352,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Supply facilities, and utilities, $374,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $8,590,000.

UNITED STATES SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $443,541,000.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including

land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and com-

munity facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified locations, 343 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 300 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 180 units.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 350 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 300 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 470 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 285 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 260 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

Loring Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 320 units.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 550 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 300 units.

Travis Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 260 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 400 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts

"$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85-685, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85-685, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,-239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40

U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $86,505,000; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $83,330,000; section 103, $5,000,000; or a total of $199,045,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $113,954,000; outside the United States, $42,265,000; section 202, $21,765,000; section 203, $5,000,000; or a total of $182,984,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $295,-

100,000; outside the United States, $65,081,000; section 302, $443,541,000; section 303, $5,000,000; or a total of $808,722,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its

Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another Department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended;

(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 507

of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES

(Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson, South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326).

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units

involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 410. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 411. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of

special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 412. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78) is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000."

SEC. 413. Titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.

Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.

Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.

Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.

Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.

Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.

Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.

Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.

Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.

Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.

Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.

East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.

El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.

Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.

Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.

Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities: $168,000.

Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.

Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.

Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.

Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.

Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.

New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.

Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.

Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.

Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.

Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.

San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.

San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.

San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.

Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.

Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.

Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.

Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.

Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.

San Jose, California: Parking lot and drill grounds, $1.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.

Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.

Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.

Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.

Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.

Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.

Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.

Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.

Colville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

Dermott, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.

Dover, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.

Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.

Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.

Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Heber Springs, Arkansas: Training facilities, $90,000.

Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.

Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.

Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.

Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.

Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.

Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.

Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.

Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.

Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.

Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Riverdale, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.

Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.

Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.

San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.

Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.

Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.

Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.

Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.

Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.

Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities and operational facilities, $364,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and troop housing, $188,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Utilities and ground improvements, $4,963,000.

Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $426,000.

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee:

Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $192,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any

facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided*, That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85–685, is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 3 of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."

"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."

"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000;" and by striking out in clause (2) (b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place

thereof "$12,446,000;" and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,702,000".

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army Reserve, $20,748,000;

(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,451,000;

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States $15,536,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1) (a), (1) (b), (2), (3) (a), and (3) (b) of section 504, respectively.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959."

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the

United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site for a United States Army Reserve Center: *Provided,* That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer

and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.

SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts except that any moneys received under section 601 (2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged.

Passed the House of Representatives April 16, 1959.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5674

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

APRIL 17 (legislative day, APRIL 15), 1959
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

H. R. 5674

AN ACT

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 14, 1959
For actions of May 13, 1959
86th-1st, No. 76

CONTENTS

Alaska.....6
Appropriations.....16
Atomic radiation.....12
Committees.....21
Education.....14
Eggs.....2
Electrification.....17,20
Farm program.....8
Foreign affairs.....13
Foreign currencies.....9
Forestry.....11
Highways.....7
Housing.....7
Military construction....9
Organization.....3
Personnel.....21
Postal rates.....19
Poultry.....2
President's message.....7
Property.....4,14
Reclamation.....5
Soil bank.....8
Surplus commodities.....9
Taxes.....10
Transportation.....10,15
Watersheds.....18
Wheat.....1,7

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee ordered reported bill to set price supports at 90% of parity on wheat. Senate received President's message on wheat, housing, and highways. Sen. Aiken and others defended farm program against recent attacks. House committee adopted resolution urging purchase, diversion, and export of eggs and poultry products. House committee ordered reported bill to extend Reorganization Act.

HOUSE

1. WHEAT. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 6737, which would set price supports on wheat at 90% of parity with acreage allotment reductions of 30%. p. D349

2. POULTRY AND EGGS. The Agriculture Committee adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary "to review all existing authority and available funds with the purpose of immediately and fully implementing in every practical manner such programs of purchase, diversion, and export of eggs and poultry products as will lead to improvement in the present critical situation in the poultry industry." p. D349

3. ORGANIZATION. The Government Operations Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 5140, to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949. p. D350

4. PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 900, to extend the authority of GSA to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty. p. D350

5. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported H. R. 5687 (amended and a clean bill will be introduced), to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California. p. D350

6. ALASKA. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 6091, to amend certain laws of the U. S. in light of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. p. D350

SENATE

7. PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE. Received from the President a message urging Congress to take prompt action to enact legislation dealing with the wheat, housing, and highway situations. pp. 7210-12

Sen. Dirksen commended the President's message and urged Congress to enact legislation to carry out his recommendations. pp. 7211-12

8. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Aiken defended the farm program against recent attacks by "newspaper and magazine articles, business organizations, some Government officials, and many individuals" as having "cast confusion and suspicion into the public mind," discussed the background and importance of the farm program to the nation, urged enactment of new legislation "to correct abuses and to put us on a sounder and more practical basis," and contended that "It is time to lay aside spite and prejudice, to take farm policies out of politics and to concentrate on maintaining, improving, and modernizing farm programs before it is too late." pp. 7219-23

Sens. Carlson, Mansfield, and Williams, Del., commended Sen. Aiken's statement and his service to agriculture. pp. 7221-2

Sen. Williams, Del., inserted a newspaper article, "Land Leased at 25 Cents Per Acre, $8 Gained From Soil Bank -- Huge New Mexico Farm Profits Bared," discussing the practice of individuals leasing land from the State and placing it in the soil bank at a profit, including reference to one employee of this Department who has participated in this practice. pp. 7222-3

9. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Armed Services Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 5674, the military construction authorization bill, which includes authorization for the use of foreign currencies accumulated under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing. pp. D347-8

10. TRANSPORTATION TAXES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee "adopted a committee resolution favoring passage of S. 5, to repeal the tax on transportation of persons." p. D348

11. FORESTRY. Sen. Neuberger inserted an article by the assistant ranger for the Klamath District of the Forest Service, "Timber Resources on Our National Forests Play Big Part in U. S. Economy," discussing sustained yield and multiple use forest practices. pp. 7213-14

12. ATOMIC RADIATION. Sen. Bridges inserted an editorial, "Fallout in Perspective," discussing the danger of radiation from atomic fallout. pp. 7214-5

13. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Sen. Sparkman inserted an address by the Commissioner-General for Economic Affairs of India, "India's Developments: Problems and Programs," discussing the need for the economic development of that country. pp. 7200-02

14. EDUCATION; PROPERTY. Received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a proposed bill "to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to school assistance in federally affected areas, so as to limit payments under such laws to situations involving tax-exempt Federal property"; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. p. 7186

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 20, 1959
For actions of May 19, 1959
86th-1st, No. 80

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriations.....10,28
Alaska.....12
Appropriations 4,10,17,28,40
Area redevelopment.....26
Banking.....15
Cooperatives.....21
Cotton.....23
Credit unions.....31
Dairy industry.....25
Eggs.....27
Electrification.....6
Grain storage.....45
Farm loans.....30
Farm program.....22,34,43
Foreign aid.....18,39
Foreign currencies.....3
Forestry.....7,13,20
Gasoline tax.....35
Holidays.....44
Honey.....32
Housing.....16
Industrial uses.....37
Inflation.....24
Labor standards.....8
Marketing.....32
Military construction...50
Milk.....47
Peanuts.....48
Personnel.....36,44
Prices.....41
Reclamation.....5,23
Research.....16,46
Small grains.....9
Subsidies.....29
Surplus commodities.....42
Tobacco.....2,49
Transportation.....14
Vehicles.....36
Water.....14
Wheat.....1,11,19,33,38

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported: Wheat price support bill. Tobacco price support bill. House committee approved wheat price support bill. House debated housing bill. Rep. Broomfield introduced and discussed farm bill. Rep. Langen urged full parity for small grain farmers. Rep. Cooley urged defeat of proposed amendment to USDA appropriation bill limiting CCC loans. Sen. Murray and other Sens., and Reps. Anderson, Mont., and Burdick introduced and Sen. Murray discussed bill to extend FHA's authority to make refinancing loans and emergency loans. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed wheat price support bill.

SEBATE

1. WHEAT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported during recess, May 18, an original bill, S. 1968, to modify acreage allotments and marketing quotas for wheat (S. Rept. 295). p. 7513

2. TOBACCO. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1901, to modify price support requirements for tobacco (S. Rept. 297). p. 7518

3. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment H. R. 5674, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including provisions for the use of foreign currencies received under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing (S. Rept. 296). p. 7518

4. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee ordered reported to the full committee H. R. 5805, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1960. p. D369

5. RECLAMATION. Passed with amendment S. 72, to authorize Interior to construct the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project. (pp. 7603-07) Sens. Williams, Del., and Lausche opposed passage of the bill, contending that this new acreage would increase the production of agricultural commodities already in surplus supply. (pp. 7605-07)
   Sen. Moss expressed satisfaction over the initiation of construction of the Stanaker Dam, Utah, and stated that it "will provide supplemental irrigation for about 14,700 acres of productive land which is constantly threatened by water shortages." p. 7556

6. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Gruening urged the development of hydroelectric power facilities in Alaska, and inserted a newspaper editorial discussing the matter. p. 7582

7. FORESTRY. Sen. Cannon inserted a Nev. Legislature resolution opposing enactment of legislation to establish wilderness preservation areas. p. 7515
   Sen. Humphrey inserted a Beltrami Co., Minn., Board of Commissioners resolution urging favorable consideration of the Secretary's recommendations on a program for the development of the national forests. p. 7517

8. LABOR STANDARDS. Received from the Labor Department a proposed bill "to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938"; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. p. 7515

HOUSE

9. SMALL GRAINS. Rep. Langen stated that farmers are "not responsible for the surpluses of barley and oats" and that imports of barley in the last 10 years are greater than the surpluses in that period, while imports of oats are "approximately equal to the surplus on hand today," and urged full parity for the small grain farmers. p. 7677

10. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Rep. Cooley urged the defeat of a proposed amendment to the 1960 agricultural appropriation bill to restrict to $50,000 CCC loans to individual producers, stating that it would "destroy the farm program." p. 7679

11. WHEAT. The Agriculture Committee "approved the provisions of H. R. 7118, as amended, concerning price supports for wheat, and directed the chairman to introduce a clean bill which will incorporate the language of H. R. 7118 as amended." p. D371

12. ALASKA. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7120, to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of Alaska into the Union (H. Rept. 369). p. 7679

13. FORESTRY. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment S. 900, to amend sec. 204 (b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of GSA to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty (H. Rept. 368). p. 7679

8. HOUSING; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Senate committee report on H. R. 5674, the military construction bill, includes the following statement:

"Because of the limited interest of the French in the Public Law 480 purchases, the Department of Defense and the Commodity Credit Corporation jointly developed a 'barter' transaction, under which $50 million of cotton and wheat were sold to third countries for various currencies which were largely converted into French francs, to produce 2,403 units of family housing for U.S. military personnel in France. However, the Defense Department reports that further transactions of this sort are not possible under revised barter rules.

"The committee is also hopeful that the Department of Agriculture will revive the barter program with the view that this program can be reopened for the barter of surplus agriculture commodities for use in construction of military housing and related items overseas."

Received the House amended version of S. 57, the housing bill for 1959, and conferees were appointed. (pp. 8021-32). House conferees have already been appointed.

9. SCHOOL LUNCH. Sen. Morse stated that "there are a minimum of 7,000 children" in the District who "need ... one square meal a day at school," and inserted his testimony on the matter before the S. D. C. Appropriations Subcommittee, including the effect of school lunch programs on scholastic status and attendance. pp. 8062-7

10. WATER. Sen. Morse inserted 2 resolutions of the Oregon State Senate urging the preservation of state and individual water rights, and urging Congress to appropriate funds for the Tualatin River Basin. pp. 8067-8

11. MUTUAL SECURITY. Sen. Dworshak inserted a statement of the Farm Bureau Federation urging a reduction in the President's mutual security program recommendations. pp. 8074-7

12. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Dodd warned that "90% of our virgin timber stand in the commercial forest area has been cut," that "we are using up our inventory of saw timber at a rate of 40% faster than its annual growth," that "erosion of our soil and the destruction of our agricultural lands have been a national disgrace," that our water supply is "proving inadequate," and that "our annual consumption of minerals is more than 6 times what it was in 1900," and urged the creation of a new Materials Policy Commission to make comprehensive legislative proposals on natural resources, the use of the capital of the World Bank and other such agencies for resource development, a liberalization of the reciprocal trade program, Government aid to resource development, and stockpiling of critical materials. pp. 8080-4

13. ADJOURNED until Tues., May 26. p. 8084

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. FARM PROGRAM; ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Dirksen inserted Secretary Benson's speech before the Chamber of Commerce Agricultural Bureau and Linn County Farm Bureau, Cedar Rapids, Ia., in which he proposed that rural electric cooperatives should have their own bank -- "their own lending institution -- which they may operate and ultimately own entirely" and suggested the establishment of "their own national policy board to direct the affairs of the bank." Concerning a June 1957 request to the REA Administrator for counsel on loan applications, the Secretary stated, "I have never interfered with any REA loan application." He stated that "the so-called farm problem is not just a farm problem -- it is a national problem," that farmers are not to blame for the problem, and that the "old, outmoded price support acreage control program ... will only make the problem worse," and urged passage of corrective farm legislation. pp. A4336-7

Sen. Humphrey inserted several articles from the "Prairie Farmer" stating that the Administration's "free market" approach to solving the farm problem would, according to certain economists, cause the "greatest strain" to fall on "the medium sized farmers, not the large operators with good reserves to ride out the adjustment, nor the small and part time farmer," that the farm policy should be changed from "subsidizing a farmer to produce crops for Government storage to one of subsidizing the farmer to produce products the people could use" and urged the passage of "a token direct compensatory plan for the dairy farmer," and the creation of a milk commission not located in USDA "to regulate the production and distribution of milk." pp. A4329-31

Sen. Langer inserted two GTA articles criticizing certain "Dixiecrats" and "Benson-Republicans" and urging an alliance between Democrats and "farm-State Republicans" to provide for an improved farm program. pp. A4339-40

15. SURPLUS FOOD. Sen. Scott inserted a statement, "Domestic Donations of USDA Surplus Foods Up 42% in First 9 Months of Fiscal Year," showing that "more than 2½ billion pounds of surplus foods have been donated by the USDA" during the first 9 months of the year, the number of persons by state receiving this food and the surplus foods donated, the quantities of each, and their costs. pp. A4335-6

16. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Humphrey inserted a National Rural Electric Cooperative Association editorial attacking a recent Time magazine article on the REA loan approval bill, S. 144, as "inaccurate," and a "blend of prejudice and propaganda." The Time article stated the bill would transfer power over REA loans to "power-hungry Clyde Ellis, director of NRECA." pp. A4334-5

17. MUTUAL SECURITY. Sen. Robertson inserted an article, "Debtor Nation? -- The U. S. Must Put Solvency Ahead of Charity." p. A4332

Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserted an editorial, "Foreign Aid Waste Calls for Closer Look by U. S." p. A4346

18. DAIRY; MILK. Sen. Wiley inserted an article, "June Dairy Month to be Launched with Heavy Nationwide Promotion -- Many Ambitious Projects Feature Annual Drive to Spur Dairy Consumption." p. A4334

Rep. Johnson, Wis., inserted an editorial, "Evidence Refutes 'Tired Milk' Charge," critical of the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association and othe opposing his national milk sanitation bill. p. A4340

19. SCHOOL LUNCH. Sen. Yarborough inserted an editorial urging the use by the Houston School Board of the Federal school lunch programs. p. A4340

20. COTTON. Rep. Hagen inserted an article, "Drastic Cut is Reported in Mexican Cotton Planting." pp. A4344-5

BILLS INTRODUCED

21. SURPLUS PROPERTY. S. 2043, by Sen. Chavez, to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books, and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the New Mexico Boys' Ranch; to Government Operations Committee.

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:
May 25: Scientific information services; H. Science and Astronautics (Mohrhardt, Library, to testify).

Calendar No. 284

86TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 296

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY DEPARTMENTS, FISCAL YEAR 1960

MAY 19, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5674]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill, H.R. 5674, to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments, within and outside the United States, and (in title V) authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components, in the total amount of $1,232,611,000, consisting of $1,227,882,000 in new authority, and an increase in prior years' authorizations of $4,729,000.

Total Authorizations Requested

Brief of authorizations

Title I (Army):	
Inside continental United States	$65, 900, 000
Outside continental United States	24, 210, 000
Classified	81, 830, 000
Emergency construction	10, 000, 000
Total	181, 940, 000
Title II (Navy):	
Inside continental United States	110, 646, 000
Outside continental United States	29, 550, 000
Classified	18, 495, 000
Emergency construction	10, 000, 000
Total	168, 691, 000
Title III (Air Force):	
Inside continental United States	289, 746, 000
Outside continental United States	71, 759, 000
Classified	443, 541, 000
Emergency construction	15, 000, 000
Total	820, 046, 000
Subtotal	1, 170, 677, 000
Deficiency authorizations:	
Title I (Army)	1, 186, 000
Title II (Navy)	640, 000
Title III (Air Force)	2, 343, 000
Total	4, 169, 000
Title V (Reserve components):	
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves	8, 300, 000
Air Force Reserve	4, 093, 000
Air National Guard	15, 580, 000
Army Reserve	20, 916, 000
Army National Guard	8, 316, 000
Total	57, 205, 000
Deficiency authorizations:	
Air National Guard	470, 000
Army Reserve	90, 000
Total	560, 000
Grand total of all authorities granted by titles I, II, III, and V	1, 232, 611, 000

Form of Committee Action

The bill on which the committee has held its hearings is S. 1086. The companion bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, is H.R. 5674. Subsequent to passage of H.R. 5674, certain additional amendments were approved by the Bureau of the Budget and requested by the Department of Defense. These changes, together with those recommended by this committee, made it desirable to report a clean bill instead of amending the House passed bill.

Summary of Military Construction Authorization

So that a review of the status of all military-construction authorization for the active forces through fiscal year 1948 to date may be made, the following summary is provided (all figures represent $1 million):

[In millions]

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Total authorizations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1959	$4,744	$4,107	$13,215	$22,066
Less unfunded authorizations repealed and rescinded through fiscal year 1958	−674	−356	−1,307	−2,337
Less estimated unfunded authorization to be repealed by sec. 507 of Public Law 85-685	−142	−182	−943	−1,267
Less appropriations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1959	−3,588	−3,307	−10,402	−17,297
Less dollar equivalent of counterpart fund pesetas utilized through fiscal year 1959	0	−50	−72	−122
Residual authorization to be available at end fiscal year 1959	340	212	491	1,043
Additional new authorization proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	+231	+195	+873	+1,299
Increases in prior year's authorization proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	+1	+1	+2	+4
Total of fiscal year 1959 residual and proposed fiscal year 1960 authorizations	572	408	1,366	2,346
Less unfunded authorization to be repealed by secs. 103(b); 203(b); 303(b); and 406 of fiscal year 1960 bill	−100	−86	−227	−413
Less proposed fiscal year 1960 appropriation	−341	−244	−894	−1,479
Less counterpart fund pesetas proposed for utilization in fiscal year 1960	0	−10	0	−10
Residual authorization to be availabe at end fiscal year 1960	131	68	245	444

This tabulation illustrates that the amount of residual authorization available to the three military departments is being steadily reduced each fiscal year. This means that each year the lowest priority projects are eliminated through the annual rescission of unfunded authorization, as provided under section 406 of this bill. Consequently, the balance of residual authorization left available consists of both urgently needed projects, and other projects for which the requirement has changed due to revisions in missions and weapons. The military departments are each using part of their annual construction appropriations to assure continued progress on the most urgent of these residual projects. The remainder of their annual appropriation is applied to essential new project authorizations. It is necessary that a proper balance and control be maintained between these two segments of the program, so that construction can satisfactorily proceed on both residual and new authorization, at a rate which is in proper relationship to the entire military construction program, and consists primarily of additional increments on projects already underway, items required to support new weapons development, and essential modernization of our bases.

Committee Review Procedure

This year, the committee again emphasized the major and special policy areas which create the forces that require the facilities authorized in the bill. It is of utmost importance to delve into these areas in order to understand and to evaluate the requirements of the military

departments. Even so, full consideration was given to each specific line item making up the construction program as will be reflected in the printed hearings.

Prior to beginning the hearings, an agenda was worked out with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the three military departments as to the major policy areas to be covered in a series of operations and special briefings. Witnesses came prepared to discuss in detail the following major programs:

1. Continental air defense.
2. Ballistic missile.
3. Strategic Air Command.
4. Antisubmarine.
5. Army aviation.
6. Strategic Army corps.
7. Troop carrier.
8. Antiballistic missile.
9. Oversea bases.
10. Family housing.

The committee had the benefit of an excellent briefing on the continental air defense program by Gen. Earle E. Partridge, Commander-in-Chief of the unified North American Air Defense Command, and still another special briefing on the activities and missions of the various missile ranges. Participating in this briefing in addition to representatives of the three military departments were representatives of National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Advanced Research Projects Agency in order that the views, opinions, and requirements of all concerned could be pulled together and evaluated.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations and the military departments are to be commended for the careful review of the 1960 military construction program prior to its submission to Congress, which has been of considerable assistance to this committee. Also of great assistance was the early submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress on February 10, 1959, thus enabling the committee to give detailed study and consideration of the overall military programs necessitating the construction authorization requests contained in the bill. This enabled the committee to complete hearings on the bill at the earliest date in recent years.

It was significant to note, however, that subsequent to the submission of the proposed legislation numerous adjustments were requested by the military departments, both during and after the hearings were completed, thus causing confusion to the orderly consideration of the bill. It is the desire of the committee that in the future more careful consideration be given by the military to firm requirements and cost estimates in making up the bill in order that subsequent adjustments may be held to a minimum.

Final Committee Action

As a result of committee action, the bill as reported differs in dollar areas from that originally presented as indicated below:

Authorizations	Original	Committee action	Difference
Active Forces:			
Army	$231,252,000	$181,940,000	−$49,312,000
Navy	195,284,000	168,691,000	−26,593,000
Air Force	872,761,000	820,046,000	−52,715,000
Total	1,299,297,000	1,170,677,000	−128,620,000
Reserve forces:			
National Guard:			
Army	8,316,000	8,316,000	
Air Force	15,536,000	15,580,000	+44,000
Total	23,852,000	23,896,000	+44,000
Organized Reserves:			
Army	20,748,000	20,916,000	+168,000
Navy and Marines	8,300,000	8,300,000	
Air Force	4,093,000	4,093,000	
Total	33,141,000	33,309,000	+168,000
Total Reserve	56,993,000		
Grand total	$1,356,290,000	$1,227,882,000	−$128,408,000

In addition to the above, the committee granted authority for the construction of 27,570 units of family housing, broken down as follows: 461 units appropriated fund housing; 3,444 units to be constructed outside the United States from funds generated through the sale of surplus commodities; and 23,665 units of Capehart housing. A limitation of 21,500 units has been placed on the number of Capehart units that may be contracted for during fiscal year 1960.

The committee's actions and recommendations are made with constructive intent and should not be construed as criticism of the Defense establishment. The committee is pleased to note that the construction bill proposed by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1960 was well thought out, austere in proportions, and considerably less than programs of recent years.

Summary of Deficiency Authorization

The bill also provides additional monetary authorization to correct deficiencies in authorization for certain projects authorized under previous military construction acts, and in some cases repeals the authorization. There follows a listing by individual project and public law of the amounts previously authorized and the amounts as changed by the bill:

Public Law	Section	Installation	Existing amount authorized	As amended by bill	Section of bill
85-241	101	Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md	$2,288,000	$2,613,000	105
85-241	101	New Cumberland General Depot, Pa	464,000	597,000	105
85-241	101	Fort Huachuca, Ariz	1,936,000	2,276,000	105
85-241	101	Fort Leonard Wood, Mo	4,663,000	5,051,000	105
534/83d	[1] 202	Classified installations	72,785,000	72,935,000	205
968/84th	201	Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tenn	511,000	664,000	206
968/84th	[2] 201	Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N.C.	273,000	330,000	206
85-241	201	Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N.C.	39,000	52,000	207
85-241	201	Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.	1,469,000	1,596,000	207
85-241	201	Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey.	130,000	320,000	207
85-241	301	Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska	1,630,000	1,895,000	305
85-685	301	Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.	1,832,000	2,182,000	306
85-685	301	Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr	3,265,000	3,890,000	306
85-685	301	Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis.	15,552,000	16,665,000	306
85-685	603	Naval Air Station, Denver, Colo	652,000	None	502
85-685	603	Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, N.Y	652,000	None	502
85-685	603	Barnes Field, Westfield, Mass	740,000	1,030,000	502
85-685	603	Various locations	300,000	480,000	503
85-685	603	Army Reserve Center, Canton, Ohio	40,000	61,000	502
85-685	603	Army Reserve Center, Greenwood, S.C	85,000	117,000	502
85-685	603	Army Reserve Center, Johnstown, Pa	99,000	136,000	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Bethlehem, Pa.	45,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Carlisle, Pa.	45,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Chester, Pa.	206,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Clayton, N. Mex.	57,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Hammonton, N.J.	175,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Ligonier, Pa.	45,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Northwest St. Paul, Minn.	130,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Pitman, N.J.	175,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Princeton, N.J.	175,000	None	502
85-685	603	Army National Guard Armory, Salem, N.J.	15,000	None	502

[1] As amended by Public Law 85-241 and 85-685.
[2] As amended by Public Law 85-685.

Hospital Construction

Again this year, the committee feels constrained to express concern over the hospital construction program of the military departments.

Originally requested in this bill was authorization for construction of nine hospitals as follows:

Location	Bed capacity	Square feet	Cost	Cost per square foot	Cost per bed
Army:					
Redstone Arsenal, Ala.[1]	46	45,822	$844,000	$18.42	$18,347
Fort Eustis, Va.[2]	150/300	129,000	4,866,000	37.72	32,440
Navy:					
Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.[3]	67	47,000	1,949,000	41.47	29,089
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P.R.[4]	40	18,900	647,000	34.23	16,175
Air Force:					
Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex	300/500	222,500	6,934,000	31.16	23,113
Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio [5]	30/50	40,870	1,348,000	32.98	44,933
George Air Force Base, Calif.[6]	50/50	43,700	1,848,000	42.29	36,960
Clark Air Force Base, Philippines [7]	200/200	108,868	4,506,000	41.39	22,530
Lakenheath-Mildenhall, United Kingdom [8]	150	85,930	3,334,000	38.80	22,226

[1] This is a conversion of an existing structure to a hospital.
[2] This is shown in S. 1086 as $4,366,000. Subsequent cost adjustment by the Army increased amount to $4,866,000.
[3] Total authorization requested is $2,343,000 which includes a garage for $10,000 and a dental clinic for $384,000.
[4] This is a 2d increment to existing facilities. The total authorization being requested is $872,000 which includes a dental clinic at $225,000.
[5] Original cost estimate was $1,983,000 but House committee reduced to $1,600,000 which figure includes an additional $251,000 for a dental clinic which was deleted for purpose of this comparison.
[6] Amount shown in bill is $2,222,000 which includes $324,000 for a dental clinic deleted for purpose of this comparison.
[7] Estimate in bill is $4,900,000 which includes $394,000 for dental clinic deleted for purpose of this comparison.
[8] In addition to figures shown in this table, there is included in total authorization request, $244,000 for a 6,300 square foot dental clinic.

Concerning hospital construction, the Department of Defense has this to say:

> Costs of military hospitals cannot be equitably compared with published costs of civilian hospitals because of a number of variables. Some of these variables include (1) method of figuring areas; (2) items included in the reported costs such as design costs, equipment costs, administrative costs, and costs of donated equipment.
>
> Military hospitals differ from civilian hospitals in the following respects: (1) expandable feature; (2) longer treatment period per patient requires additional facilities such as occupational therapy, morale and welfare departments; (3) flight surgeon's department; (4) public health activities; (5) larger storage space to provide emergency and mobilization medical supplies; (6) space for instruction of technicians.
>
> In addition to the above, military construction is subject to more stringent procurement regulations which provide for more detailed specifications, inspection, and testing. Also, contracts provide for minimum wage rates set by the Department of Labor. Military projects are generally located in more or less isolated areas where suitable labor is not easily obtainable, thus causing premiums to be paid.
>
> With reference to comparable costs of civilian hospitals with those indicated in the fiscal year 1960 military construction program, Redstone Arsenal is a conversion project and as such, a comparative analysis would not be feasible. The hospital at Roosevelt Roads, P.R., is in the same category, since it is to be constructed on existing foundations. In the Air Force listing, Clark Air Force Base and Lakenheath-

Mildenhall Area, U.K., are overseas projects and comparative analyses are impractical.

For the remaining projects where comparisons might be feasible, costs of 28 comparative civilian hospitals have been noted. Paradoxically, these vary from $22.60 per square foot for a 100-bed hospital to $40.50 per square foot for a 220-bed hospital. These represent community hospitals (built with the aid of Hill-Burton funds) with prices adjusted to October 1958 as obtained from Public Health Service records. These prices include construction costs, equipment, design, inspection, and administrative costs. To make these costs comparable with the fiscal year 1960 program, approximately 5 percent should be added, but since military hospital prices do not include certain items of expendable equipment included in the above costs we might consider this a standoff.

The committee agrees that it is most difficult to compare military hospital costs with the costs of civilian hospitals; perhaps for the reasons stated above, but also because civilian hospital costs made available to this committee include the entire package which includes all collateral equipment. In other words, the overall cost of a hospital ready to operate. The committee found it difficult to compare costs of one military hospital with another. In this regard, the Department of Defense has advised that requirements vary at each location. Hospital designs are tailor made to suit each mission and there is no consistency in all the features. For example, hospital designs with expandible chassis cost more per square foot or per bed than hospitals in which all the beds are provided initially. Also hospitals designed for special purposes generally cost more per bed and per foot than general purpose hospitals.

The costs per square foot submitted by the military departments were based only on the cost of the building structure and did not include utilities or movable equipment. For the purpose of the above comparisons, the committee included utilities in the overall costs, although no provision was made for movable equipment. Certainly utilities are an integral part of the original cost of the hospital and should be so included. Due to the lack of sufficient information in the variance of the type of movable equipment that might be installed in a military and civilian hospital, no effort was made to include in the above computations the cost of such equipment, which for example, in the case of the Clinton County hospital amounts to an estimated $78,000.

In order to show as nearly comparable figures as possible between the military and civilian hospital costs, the committee has deleted from cost computations space and costs allocated for dental clinics in military hospitals, even though these costs go to make up the total cost of the project.

Figures made available to the committee from independent reliable sources disclose that the New Washington Medical Center in Washington, D.C., reputed to be one of the most modern hospitals in the country, cost less per bed, exclusive of movable equipment, but inclusive of a nurse quarters than several of those requested in this bill. Under the Hill-Burton Act, the average construction costs for the last 4 months of 1958 for hospital construction amounted to $19,500 per bed. By way of explanation, this figure includes every-

thing for a complete operating hospital. The range of costs under the Hill-Burton Act were from $12,860 per bed to $22,840 per bed. The costs per square foot ranged from $14.53 to $34.37. This again, includes a complete hospital ready to operate. The committee has been informed that most excellent facilities and construction can be obtained for $31.06 per square foot. From private sources, it has been ascertained that the rule of thumb for hospital construction in some Southern States is $10,000 per bed.

It may be seen from these comparisons that the estimated costs of proposed construction of military hospitals are excessive when compared to civilian hospitals, even allowing for special military requirements. The committee feels that this is attributable, at least in part, to the excessive use of refinements, superfluous equipment, and overloading of criteria which are not essential to the welfare of the patients. It is the desire of the committee that military personnel and their dependents be provided the best of medical and hospital facilities in every respect; however, hospital construction must be on a more modest basis.

COMMITTEE ACTION

In light of the above, the committee at this time does not recommend authorization for the hospitals listed above until more realistic cost estimates are forthcoming, with the exception of the hospitals at Clark Air Force Base, Philippine Islands, the Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico and the Lakenheath-Mildenhall Hospital in England. Testimony indicates that the hospitals at Clark Air Force Base and the naval station at Roosevelt Roads are badly needed. They appear to be planned on a relatively austere basis and the Clark Air Force Base hospital services the entire Far Eastern area, serving personnel of the three military services as well as civilian personnel of the State Department and other agencies. The Lakenheath-Mildenhall Hospital is a Commodity Credit project, and a real need exists for this structure.

The committee does not intend to imply that these hospitals are not needed, but simply that cost estimates appear to be entirely unrealistic. The question of authorization for these hospitals is open for further consideration if more reasonable estimates are forthcoming. The committee desires to emphasize however, that if new estimates are forthcoming and approved by the committee, the military departments will be expected to stay within those estimates and not return at a later time for further authorization.

The committee has, therefore, deleted from title I, the hospitals at Redstone Arsenal, Ala., and Fort Eustis, Va.; from title II, the hospitals at the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., and from title III, the hospitals at Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., the Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, and the George Air Force Base, Calif.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain

The committee has deleted from the bill an authorization request for operational facilities at the Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain, in the amount of $11,934,000. If granted, this authorization would permit the dredging of Rota Harbor to a depth of 40 feet for the purpose of permitting large tankers and certain carriers to go alongside a pier. Considerable sums have been previously authorized and obligated

for facilities at this naval air station, including dredging the harbor to a depth of 35 feet. After carefully considering testimony and other data relating to this project, the committee is of the opinion that it does not have the priority of others that are being deferred. Present facilities are sufficient to accommodate large tankers. The committee believes that the funds required to accomplish this dredging might better be used for modernizing the fleet and other high priority requirements.

NORAD Headquarters

The committee has approved the authorization requested in the amount of $10 million for the underground Combat Operations Center at the North American Air Defense Command Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colo. The Department of the Air Force has advised that a definite site in the area of Cheyenne Mountains has been selected and that the center as presently planned will provide the desired blast over pressure protection. The estimated cost of the completed structure is approximated at $28.5 million.

Air Academy

The committee is greatly concerned over many aspects of the construction program at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colo.

The Comptroller General of the United States in a report dated April 1959, states that the original authorization of $139 million will have been expanded without specific authority from Congress to $269 million. This seems to be a disregard of congressional authority. The Air Academy was not authorized in a general construction bill by this subcommittee but by a special act of Congress. The committee proposes to investigate the matter and to determine where the responsibility rests for this apparent disregard of congressional intent. In the meantime, the committee requests that no new contracts be let without specific consultation with the Armed Services Committees. The committee further desires that it be distinctly understood that no steps be taken to construct airfield facilities at the Academy unless line item authorization is first obtained from the committees.

Bolling-Anacostia Airfields

For some time now the committee has expressed grave concern over the problems arising from multiple utilization of airspace by military and civilian aircraft. A case in point is the Bolling-Anacostia facilities, Washington, D.C. Considerable funds have been authorized and appropriated to enable the Department of the Air Force and the Department of the Navy to move their operations from Bolling-Anacostia to the Andrews Air Force Base and the John Tower Air Facility located at Andrews. It is hoped this transition will be completed in the near future. The committee expects no further expenditures to be made for the expansion or conversion of the Bolling-Anacostia facilities other than for ordinary and necessary maintenance unless specifically authorized by the Committees on the Armed Services.

Air Defense Systems

For several years the committee has emphasized the importance of decisive action by the Department of Defense to eliminate wasteful

overlapping in weapons systems. This is particularly true in the area of antiaircraft missiles which have been the subject of extensive discussion and deliberation. In an attempt to force a decision in this regard, the committee last year reduced the construction authorization for antiaircraft missiles by 20 percent and made the combined remainder available for utilization in the systems selected by the Secretary of Defense. The committee was desirous that an entire reappraisal be made of the air-defense concept solely in terms of effectiveness and without preference to individual systems or military departments to assure the most defense for the dollar invested. The clear-cut decision desired has not been made. The following questioning of the Secretary of Defense that occurred during hearings on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1960 clearly illustrates the current status of the subject:

> Senator STENNIS. Now, my question, Mr. Secretary, with great deference to you, is this:
>
> I want to know if you have reached a decision. Apparently you have not stopped any of these programs; you are letting both of them go forward, but both of them on a limited scale.
>
> My question is: Have you reached a decision as to either one of them, and why not give one or the other the green light and let it go ahead rather than take two along, NIKE and BOMARC, on a reduced scale?
>
> Secretary MCELROY. There is no question that, as mentioned earlier in one of these hearings, that this is one of the areas of our defense work which has been, I suppose, more difficult than any I have touched to receive in a way that is at all satisfying.
>
> Senator STENNIS. You say this is the most difficult matter that you have had to deal with; is that right?
>
> Secretary MCELROY. It really is, yes. What is involved here, as I also indicated earlier, is that you have a shifting of the type of attacking vehicles against which you must defend.
>
> You expect they will continue to be bombers. You think as the years go by the bomber coming in will be of lesser importance than another type of incoming weapon, which while it uses the air will not be defendable against, by the same weapon as you use to defend against bombers.
>
> Now, we have had to say to ourselves—this is what we said about our own attacking force—until we can really believe that there is going to be an effective missile attacking force against us, we have got to assume that the effective force of the enemy is going to be bomber in the same way that we say our effective attacking force against him for some years to come is going to be the bomber.
>
> Therefore, our defense must be an antibomber defense.
>
> Now, coming to your question as to why we need both of these, and this has been given immense study, it seems from the best views we have, including our Joint Chiefs of staff, and General Twining may want to comment on this when I have finished, that the thing which will happen in the future to the bomber will be an increase in speed and also I am

talking now about a Russian incoming bomber and also that the bomber will have missiles of the HOUNDDOG type, just as we expect ours to have missiles of the HOUNDDOG type, therefore our job is to push further out with our defense, and therefore count less and less on what we thought as the point defense.

With that as a likelihood of the bomber problem against which we must defend, we continue our work on the development of the F–108 interceptor, which is mach 3, which is long range, it is a very sophisticated aircraft and combination system. It is really a combination of an aircraft and missile which gives you a system concept.

That gives your furtherest reach out. Then, for missile purposes, it looks very much as if the BOMARC with its, we hope, about four to five hundred mile range in the new version, will have the greatest backup to the interceptor because it does have the ability to reach out.

Now, we push the interceptor as far as we can north and to the east and in whatever direction we think these may be coming from.

But we then have a BOMARC capability flown from the interceptor zone where we can have a peripheral protection, including the protection that would be supplied to some degree by BOMARC's in Canada.

Now, you may recall, having read the Canadian Government decided to abandon its high performance interceptor and give up the production of this CF–105, but in doing so it also decided to buy some BOMARC's following the determination of the Canadian Government as to the system it would rely on for the alternative kind of air defense.

So here you have interceptors and the decision of both cabinets on a combination of BOMARC and interceptors.

Now, there is one other factor in this. That is that the SAGE system which is the system that directs both the BOMARC and the interceptors to their targets can be effective in guiding both of those. We have not yet integrated the NIKE system into that SAGE ground environment directional system.

So to net it down, it looks to me again, with plenty of conversation I am afraid still going on in the Defense Department before we get it defined, there will be interceptors to the north, there will need to be a stream of BOMARC sites around the periphery and only a relatively small number of additional high priority target areas will be considered as further NIKE sites, I believe.

Senator STENNIS. Frankly, I can understand, then, your leanings toward BOMARC. Apparently its future being so much more extensive, I cannot understand why you keep recommending the installations and support installations for NIKE.

Now, if I vote to recommend that to the Congress, I am saying to my colleagues and the American people that I believe it is more important there than it is to go toward modernizing the Army so to speak, with weapons and mod-

ernizing the Navy ships and increasing our Marine landing teams and Army combat battalions, and I just do not believe that that is true.

I do not want to certify in a bill that I believe that these priorities are that when I think just to the contrary very strongly.

As I say, that is no hasty conclusion. It is based on testimony.

I am beginning to think that the Department of Defense itself would welcome a congressional decision on this matter and then you could move on into a more positive program.

Secretary McElroy. You certainly have touched us in a place where I would call vulnerable.

Senator Stennis. I do not want to embarrass you.

Secretary McElroy. You are not embarrassing us. This is one where we have not done very well in making a decision.

As far as I am concerned, it would not bother me if you held our feet to the fire and forced us in connection with this budget.

Senator Stennis. I appreciate your attitude tremendously, because I frankly think that is what has to be done, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary McElroy. I think it is time.

Senator Stennis. I think we can assure you a recommendation along that line, anyway. I do not know what will be the outcome of it.

The NIKE system has evolved through several stages—NIKE-AJAX, NIKE-HERCULES, and later, an improved NIKE-HERCULES. These modifications and conversions have entailed large expenditures while achieving relatively modest extensions in the range at which an incoming aircraft could be detected and destroyed. This range capability could be seriously inadequate, particularly against "standoff" bombers equipped with air-to-surface missiles.

Although the military construction costs of converting NIKE-AJAX sites is relatively minor, the cost in missiles, warheads, and personnel is substantial. The committee is disturbed by the dangers attending the storage of atomic warheads for these missiles in populated areas. Another danger is that which would result from the detonation of these atomic warheads at short ranges over the defended populated areas.

It is the committee's view that intercontinental ballistic missiles are becoming the primary threat to bases of the Strategic Air Command and that the required missile defense against aircraft should be provided by area type weapons that afford multipurpose protection of cities, strategic bases, and other vital facilities.

The committee has concluded that the NIKE-AJAX–NIKE-HERCULES system is virtually obsolete and that the further expenditure of funds to expand the system, except in overseas areas where it might have a tactical value, is unwarranted. It is not the purpose of the committee to weaken our defense, but to the contrary to strengthen it. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense give renewed consideration to a reappraisal of the perimeter defense concept to assure the best air defense system possible.

COMMITTEE ACTION

To effectuate its views, the committee has deleted $17,332,000 of the $22,413,000 requested in the bill as new authority for extension and improvement of the NIKE system. The authority granted is for improvement of the system outside the United States, for one new installation there, and for construction affecting the welfare and comfort of personnel assigned to existing installations within the United States.

The committee proposes to repeal authorization for the construction of 50 NIKE-HERCULES batteries at 25 locations within the United States and for 8 batteries in Hawaii, and asks the Department of Defense for a revised program. This construction was authorized in Public Law 85–685 but has not yet been placed under contract. Until final congressional action has been taken on this proposed cancellation, the committee expects the Department not to make contract awards under this authorization. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to come forward with such a master plan in sufficient time for the committee to give consideration to such plan before this Congress adjourns in order that it may present its recommendations to the Congress.

Organization for Air Defense

The committee still is concerned about the division of responsibility within the air defense field.

The following excerpts from testimony by the commander in chief of the North American Air Defense Command is illustrative of this problem:

> Senator Stennis. Now going right on one step further that I have never been able to understand, this Air Force installation for SAC bombers, say it is No. A, and you are in command of its defense. If you detect a bomber coming in, you send up Air Force planes to intercept it, but if it gets on through then you have the Army try to shoot it down. Now why do you call on the Air Force at one point and the Army on the other? Why is that divided responsibility?
>
> General Partridge. That is a very good question. If we were going to take a clean sheet of paper and start over again, the whole air defense system should be in one service. The detection, surveillance, and everything should be in one service. It would make it very much simpler. But the fact of the matter is that the Army has, by its roles and missions, the job of providing weapons for air defense, surface-to-air missiles for air defense, and it's doing so. But the system which operates these is the North American Air Defense Command. All of these units operate under techniques and procedures set down by my headquarters.
>
> Senator Stennis. This is not a personal question at all, but as the commander who has charge of all of it, have you ever proposed or do you consider proposing a plan that will start to eliminate this situation and bring it in line with what you say it should be?
>
> General Partridge. I have never proposed such a plan, but I have certainly thought about it a lot of times.

Senator STENNIS. Well, you might propose it to us. We came pretty near putting it into effect. It would help us in our thinking, General. This is a most serious concern to us as I know it is to you, although you and I have never discussed this matter.

General PARTRIDGE. It is to me. Quite seriously, let me say if we could get all the air defense activities under a single service, it would be a far better arrangement than we have today, and let me give you just one example.

The Army has the job of developing NIKE-ZEUS. This is probably going to be one of the most complicated pieces of equipment, most demanding pieces of equipment, ever built for military or any other use. At the same time, the Air Force has been given the job of providing the early warning system. These systems must be completely integrated, and it would be ever so much easier, from the commander's point of view in Colorado Springs, where the systems have to tie together, if one service were doing the job.

I do not know that we can ever bring that about, and I would not propose it. But it would be easier that way.

Senator STENNIS. I want to make clear that I think the Army, as I understand it, has done an excellent job with what has been assigned to them, and they have an excellent antimissile missile program and antibomber program. I am talking about the system alone, and I think that this is a glaring defect. It seems to me this divided responsibility is one of the things that is pushing all the services right on into one service, one command, and one uniform, it is so glaring.

I saw a news item the other day that 15 Air Force officers and 15 Army officers had been in conference with reference to a NIKE installation, and that just pointed up the manpower, the talent, the time, and everything else, that was consumed there. They were cooperating, but they had 15 officers meeting from each group.

I do not want to take too much time, but it is a matter this subcommittee has been interested in for many years.

The committee is convinced that the Secretary of Defense has adequate authority to provide for an integrated responsibility for air defense, and sharply defined areas of responsibility. In the committee's opinion, this authority existed before the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. If there were any doubt however about such authority, the 1958 act eliminated it. The committee urges the Secretary to devote further attention to the assignment of functions in air defense.

ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION FOR AIRCRAFT AND MISSILES

Section 413 of the bill would initiate a requirement for an annual authorization for the design, development, and procurement of aircraft and missiles.

Large amounts are being appropriated annually for aircraft and missiles on the basis of authorizations that are exceedingly broad in

terms. More than $9 billion of proposed appropriations for these purposes are contained in the defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1960.

The authorizations on which these large appropriations are based are no more specific than that "the Secretary of the Army may procure materials and facilities necessary to maintain and support the Army * * *", that "the President may acquire, construct, or manufacture naval airplanes, spare parts, and equipment necessary to provide and maintain 15,000 useful naval airplanes * * *", that "the Secretary of the Navy may procure and construct guided missiles", and that "the Secretary of the Air Force may procure guided missiles and 24,000 serviceable aircraft or 225,000 airframe tons of serviceable aircraft, whichever the Secretary considers appropriate."

The aircraft and missiles procured under these authorizations, while entailing large expenditures in themselves, also generate requirements for expenditures in other major budget categories, such as personnel, construction, and operations and maintenance. Lack of specificity in authorization for aircraft and missile procurement is in sharp contrast to the detailed annual authorizations for military construction which prescribe locations, categories, and amounts of construction authorization to be undertaken.

The committee has concluded that in the discharge of its legislative responsibilities an annual review of the aircraft and missile procurement programs is needed. A thorough examination of this area of activity may serve to reduce the enormous cost of defense and should assist the Committees on Appropriations in their consideration of the mammoth defense budget.

Missile Ranges

The committee is deeply concerned over the magnitude of expenditures which have been proposed in the fiscal year 1960 military construction authorization program for missile range facilities. For the three services, these proposed authorizations total approximately $110 million.

The Army portion of this proposed program approximates $71 million for facilities at the White Sands, N. Mex., national range, the McGregor and Oro Grande ranges in Texas, at Kwajalein and Johnson Islands in the Pacific, and at Ascension Island in the Atlantic.

The Navy program of $31 million is primarily in furtherance of another national missile range, namely the Pacific range, Point Mugu, Calif., and segments located at San Nicholas and San Clemente Islands, Calif., Eniwetok, Kaneohe Bay, T.H., Wake and Midway Islands in the Pacific, and at the Air Force Missile Training Command, Patrick Air Force Base, Fla.

Approximately $8 million will be applied by the Air Force to further construction of facilities relating to the third national range at Cape Canaveral, Fla., and segments at Ascension Island, Antigua, British West Indies; and Santa Rosa Island, Fla.

A further discussion of the missions of the three national missile ranges is contained later in this report.

Although the vital importanee of the missile development program which these ranges support is fully recognized, the committee feels that greater efforts must be made to reduce expenditures for the continued expansion of the numerous ranges which are now in use by the three separate Departments.

It is recognized that both overwater and overland ranges are necessary, due to special instrumentation, support, and recovery problems which are inherent in the missile development field. The committee is not convinced, however, that the future expansion which has been projected for the various missile ranges would be necessary to the extent proposed if each range is given maximum utilization, and joint use by the three services is made fully available. It would appear that some duplication certainly exists between the Atlantic and the Pacific missile ranges, and the Department of Defense is called upon to be sure that duplicate and overlapping capabilities are not provided at both of these ranges in support of firing activities which could be accomplished at one or the other separately by better planning and scheduling of firing activities.

The committee will look with disfavor upon further land acquisitions to expand existing overland ranges.

Military Family Housing

In the report on last year's bill the committee devoted considerable attention to the subject of family housing, in recognition of its importance for the retention of career personnel, and the magnitude of the various programs designed to meet the need. The committee expressed its concern over the possibility of overbuilding, and emphasized its desire that care be taken to relate the size of proposed projects with conservative estimates of long-range personnel strengths.

The requested authorization for housing units originally presented to the committee was for 21,701, as follows:

	Number of appropriated fund units in bill	Number of Capehart units in bill	Number of surplus commodity units in bill	Total number of units in bill
Army	326	6,199	557	7,082
Navy	0	4,322	100	4,422
Air Force	135	8,025	2,037	10,197
Total	461	18,546	2,694	21,701

Subsequently, however, the Defense Department submitted revised requests bringing this total up to 26,310 units. To briefly illustrate the magnitude of the family housing problem, from August 1, 1952, to February 28, 1959, 103,731 units of family housing were placed under contract at a total cost of $1,594,205,000. In addition, if all units requested in this bill are placed under contract, a contingent liability of $455,202,000 will result, with the total eventual cost of $733,854,945. There follows a detailed analysis of the housing program.

PROGRAMING LIMITS

With regard to the principle domestic program (Capehart), last year's report requested that the Secretary of Defense, prior to advertising for bids, certify that proposed projects were consistent with long-range troop projections, and either would not raise total military assets at installations above 55 percent of gross requirements, or were exceptions justified on the basis of isolation or unusual military conditions.

Subsequently, the Secretary of Defense has certified to the committees 46 Capehart projects totaling 16,509 units, through February 17, 1959. Of the projects certified, 21 (10,027 units) were within the 55 percent limit, and 25 (6,482 units) were justified as exceptions on the basis of isolation or military necessity.

The various housing programs have been explored at great length with family housing personnel of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, and the three military departments, in order to get a comprehensive picture of the size of the need, how it is determined, the accomplishments to date, and future planning.

DETERMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS

First of all, the committee has been advised that the Defense Department's policy on the provision of family housing is as follows:

1. Consideration will be given to meeting the housing requirements of military personnel entitled to quarters allowances under permanent legislation, and of essential civilian employees.

2. In programs to meet housing requirements, existing community support will be utilized to the greatest practicable degree. Government-owned or controlled housing will be provided for personnel required to reside on-station by reason of military necessity, and for other personnel for whom it is impracticable to obtain adequate private housing at reasonable rentals and locations.

It is noted that the policy makes no provision for family housing for personnel of the lower enlisted pay grades. In calculating the gross requirements for a particular installation, the servicewide marriage factors are applied to the projected long-range strengths, based on the latest available forecasts for the installation and its component activities. The marriage factors currently used for the officers and enlisted grades are: Army, 84 and 24; Navy, 75 and 35; Air Force, 80 and 32. The enlisted percentages reflect the proportion of married upper grade enlisted personnel to all enlisted personnel, and are based on payroll records.

In determining the size of a proposed project, the gross requirements for the installation (including those for a few key civilians) are first reduced by all existing and planned adequate assets, both Government-owned and private. In addition, a safety factor amounting to at least 10 percent (20 percent in foreign countries) of the gross requirements is deducted; this factor is increased for nonisolated areas. As a further precaution against overbuilding in the United States, Territories, and possessions, on-post construction is limited to a maximum of 55 percent of gross requirements (75 percent in isolated areas or where required by military necessity, and even higher in exceptional cases, such as extremely isolated Air Force bases in the "northern tier"). Field requests for projects are carefully scrutinized during the course of review, in order to insure that priority is given to the more urgently needed projects. Moreover, large projects are normally broken down into two or more increments.

MAGNITUDE OF THE NEED

Defense Department witnesses testified during the hearings that overall requirements for officers and upper grade enlisted men totaled 859,345 units, based on the currently authorized military strength of 2,520,000. This compared to a requirement of 680,000 units reported a year earlier, based on a total military strength of 2,600,000. Two reasons were given for this requirements increase in the face of declining force levels: a constantly increasing percentage of married personnel, and the inclusion for the first time of the requirements for Navy fleet personnel (135,750 units). Although some provision is now being made in the Navy's program for housing for dependents of fleet personnel in home port areas, these requirements cannot be precisely pinpointed to those areas, and therefore are subject to additional safety factors in programing. Total assets increased from the 455,800 units reported last year to 542,936 units. A detailed tabulation is as follows:

Military family housing requirements and assets as of Dec. 31, 1958

	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Currently authorized strength	2,520,000	870,000	805,000	845,000
Projected gross requirements [1]	877,225	253,300	285,205	338,720
Officers	242,380	73,790	64,390	104,200
Senior enlisted	616,965	171,300	216,965	228,700
Key civilians	17,880	8,210	3,850	5,820
Assets	542,936	164,778	163,880	214,278
Military controlled [2]	329,029	123,792	58,804	146,433
Public quarters	(128,926)	(66,545)	(22,041)	(40,340)
Capehart	(91,078)	(26,786)	(11,318)	(52,974)
Wherry [3]	(81,887)	(20,111)	(24,128)	(37,648)
Leased	(6,431)	(5,700)	(66)	(665)
Surplus commodity	(15,169)	(2,498)	(1,251)	(11,420)
Rental guaranty	(5,538	(2,152)	(0)	(3,386)
Community support	213,907	40,986	105,076	67,845
Deficit	334,289	88,522	121,325	124,442
Programed construction (military) [4]	25,718	7,311	4,914	13,493
Public quarters (rehabilitation)	1,517	79	492	946
Public quarters (new construction)	461	326	0	135
Capehart	18,546	6,199	4,322	8,025
Surplus commodity	2,694	557	100	2,037
Leased	2,500	150	0	2,350
Net deficit	308,571	81,211	116,411	110,949

[1] Estimated as of June 30, 1962; includes 135,700 for Navy fleet personnel.
[2] Includes existing, under contract and authorized but not under contract, excludes 21,800 Navy rental units adequate for junior enlisted men and nonkey civilians.
[3] Excludes 1,223 units not planned for acquisition and about 600 units to be lost in rehabilitation and modification.
[4] All, except public quarters to be rehabilitated, included in military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1960.

SEVEN YEARS' PROGRESS

In order to get a picture of what has been done in recent years to provide military family housing, the committee has compiled a list of results under the "Appropriated funds, Capehart, surplus commodity, and rental guaranty programs." During the years fiscal year 1953 through fiscal year 1959 a total of 103,731 units have been provided under these programs, at a total cost of $1,594,205,000.

New family housing units placed under contract from July 1, 1952, to Feb. 28, 1959, under the 4 major Department of Defense programs

Program	Army		Navy		Air Force		Total	
	Number of units	Cost	Number of units	Cost	Number of units	Cost	Number of units	Cost
Appropriated funds [1]	8,546	$152,000,000	3,259	$58,263,000	7,496	$121,867,000	19,301	$332,130,000
Capehart [2]	21,545	355,316,000	6,574	105,935,000	41,959	680,424,000	70,078	1,141,675,000
Surplus commodity [3]	1,992	34,091,000	879	12,716,000	5,943	73,107,000	8,814	119,132,000
Rental guarantee [4]	2,152	0	0	0	3,386	486,000	5,538	486,000
Total	34,235	541,407,000	10,712	176,914,000	58,784	875,884,000	103,731	1,594,205,000

[1] Excludes 1,673 units authorized, of which 1,423 will probably be placed under contract.

[2] Excludes 21,289 units authorized, of which all will probably be placed under contract; cost includes $55,295,000 of appropriated funds used for site acquisition and preparation and off-site utilities.

[3] Includes 1,582 units transferred from rental guarantee by prepayment of rent with $8.5 million surplus commodity funds; cost excludes $3.9 million for community facilities in United Kingdom and $200,000 in Spain; cost also includes as much as 25 percent of appropriated funds in most projects.

[4] Cost is actual liability incurred above housing allowances paid to occupants.

As can be seen, principal reliance has been placed on the Capehart program to meet requirements in the United States, Territories, and possessions, supplemented by the surplus commodity and rental guaranty programs in foreign countries, and by appropriated funds programs where none of the first three is feasible.

THIS YEAR'S BILL

Authorization requests for fiscal year 1960 presented by the military departments to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations totaled 65,135 units for the MCA, Capehart, and Surplus Commodity programs. During the course of review by the Assistant Secretary's Office, these requests were reduced to 26,310 units, as set forth in the following table:

Military family housing units proposed for the fiscal year 1960 military construction authorization bill

	Appropriated fund units		Capehart units		Surplus commodity		Total	
	Requested by services	Approved by OSD	Requested by services	Approved by OSD	Requested by services	Approved by OSD	Requested by services	Approved by OSD
Army	470	[1] 326	22,005	[2] 7,399	7,856	577	30,331	8,282
Navy	0	0	6,804	[2] 4,522	634	100	7,438	4,622
Air Force	189	135	21,610	[2] 10,484	5,567	[3] 2,787	27,366	13,406
Total	659	[1] 461	50,419	[2] 22,405	14,057	3,444	65,135	26,310

[1] Excludes 12 for Charleston TC depot added by House Armed Services Committee.
[2] Includes 3,699 units (1,200 Army, 200 Navy, and 2,299 Air Force) not requested in S. 1086, but for which DOD seeks authorization; excludes 610 units added for Charleston (350) and Perrin (260) Air Force Bases by House Armed Services Committee.
[3] Includes 140 units for aircraft control and warning sites in Spain and 600 units at classified locations not requested in S. 1086, but for which DOD seeks authorization.

It should be pointed out that in addition to the number of units requested in the bill, there will be a carryover into fiscal year 1960 of some 5,000 units of Capehart housing previously authorized but not yet placed under contract.

Deletions or reductions in the military departments requests were made by OASD(P&I) in accordance with the review criteria set forth above. An analysis of individual projects indicates that some were cut because they exceeded the on-base construction limits, and many second or third increments were deferred pending evaluation of the impact of previously authorized construction. Some projects were cut because of uncertainty as to future base manning levels.

The 461 appropriated fund units consist of 156 units for West Point, 80 units for Army NIKE sites, 135 units for Air Force radar sites, 40 in Alaska, and 50 at a classified Army installation overseas where it is infeasible or impossible to build under the Capehart or surplus commodity programs. The 22,405 Capehart units shown above are all in the United States, except for 150 in Puerto Rico, and the 3,444 surplus commodity units are divided into 700 for Army and Air Force in France, 100 for Navy in Bermuda, 1,404 for Air Force in England, and 1,240 for Army and Air Force at classified locations.

In addition to the above, this year's bill would increase the authority to lease family housing at tactical sites from 5,000 to 7,500 units. The

Defense Department proposes to proceed with additional rental guaranty housing, and is continuing to develop a program for off-base "sales" housing for essential civilians at research and development installations under the provisions of section 809 of the National Housing Act, as amended. The committee recognizes the need for a variety of programs to meet the varying types of demand for family housing throughout the world; but it is essential in evaluating this vast undertaking to consider the major categories of housing, and both the initial and eventual costs.

As may be seen from the below tabulation, the initial cost of the 26,310 housing units proposed in this year's bill is $445 million, but the eventual cost will amount to $734 million. Although it is estimated that this latter sum may be recovered from forfeited housing allowances in a period of less than 27 years, this analysis is exclusive of the costs of maintenance and operation and of furniture, which the committee last year estimated would approximate an additional $75 and $25 per month, respectively. These secondary costs lend support to the committee's view that programing of family housing should be held to the absolute minimum consistent with the retention of career personnel.

Cost of family housing items in S. 1086 [1]

Total initial cost	$455, 202, 000
Appropriated funds	[2] 12, 457, 000
Capehart	[3] 380, 885, 000
Surplus commodity	[4] 61, 860, 000
Total eventual cost	[5] 733, 854, 945
Appropriated funds	[6] 19, 725, 790
Capehart	[7] 646, 854, 755
Surplus commodity	[8] 67, 274, 400

[1] Excludes units to be provided under leasing authority contained in general provisions (which provides for leasing units on a year-to-year basis rather than for construction of units).

[2] 461 units; estimated cost (authorization requested) for housing and other site improvements, such as utilities, landscaping, streets, sidewalks, etc., and offsite utilities and roads.

[3] 22,405 units; estimated cost of housing and other site improvements, snch as utilities, landscaping, streets, sidewalks, etc. ($16,200 per unit) and offsite utilities and roads, site acquisition and/or preparation ($800 per unit).

[4] 3,444 units; estimated cost of housing and other related site improvements as above ($15,000 per unit in United Kingdom, an average of $20,000 per unit elsewhere); excludes cost of community facility buildings (hospitals, schools, etc.), for which authorization requested, because these are not strictly housing.

[5] Recovered from forfeited quarters and station allowances in less than 26 years, 8 months. Appropriated funds units (461) and Capehart units (22,405) require forfeiture of quarters allowances which average about $90 per month. Surplus commodity units (2,694) require forfeiture of both quarters and station allowances which together average about $120 per month; of this amount, however, about $50 must be paid for maintenance and operation expenses, so that only $70 per month is available for amortization.

[6] Initial cost plus $7,268,790 as cost of Treasury borrowing (4 percent over 25-year term).

[7] Initial cost plus $265,969,755 as cost of financing and mortgage insurance over 25-year term. Interest on private mortgages, $242,130,835 (4½ percent or $10,807 per unit). Cost of mortgage insurance, $13,375,785 (¼ of 1 percent on declining balances). Cost of Treasury borrowing of appropriated funds for offsite work, $10,463,135 (4 percent or $467 per unit).

[8] Initial cost plus $5,414,400 as cost of Treasury borrowing (4 percent over 25-year term) on 15 percent of total initial cost to be expended from appropriated funds in lieu of foreign currencies. Foreign currencies, which comprise 75 percent or more of initial cost, are considered as non-interest-bearing loan from CCC.

THE CAPEHART PROGRAM

Under the Capehart program the Federal Housing Administration insured mortgage covers all onsite costs, within the project boundaries. Appropriated funds are used to cover site acquisition, where necessary, utility connections to the site, and, in a few exceptional instances, rough site preparation. The maximum average unit cost per project cannot exceed $16,500 from mortgage proceeds, and $1,500 from appropriated funds. Of the 72,713 Capehart units completed or under contract on April 20, 1959, the average mortgage was $15,526 and the

average appropriated funds expenditure was $794, for a total average unit cost of $16,320. The Defense Department recognizes that the interest charges under the Capehart program are somewhat higher than the cost of long-term direct Treasury borrowing, but contends that the size of the housing program, together with competition with priority military items for available funds, has precluded a large-scale use of direct appropriations for military family housing.

A more detailed picture of progress under the Capehart program is as follows:

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT, PROGRESS, AND COST OF MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNDER THE CAPEHART PROGRAM, AS OF APR. 20, 1959

Development and progress

Stage of development	Army		Navy		Air Force		Total, all services	
	Project	Units	Project	Units	Project	Units	Project	Units
Total authorized	99	27,075	29	11,318	113	52,974	241	91,367
Completed	40	10,732	4	975	19	11,360	63	23,067
Under construction [1]	35	11,823	12	6,824	68	30,999	115	49,646
Advertised	16	4,034	11	3,442	14	6,934	41	14,410
In process [2]	8	486	2	77	12	3,681	22	4,244

[1] Includes 5,557 completed units in partially completed projects.
[2] Includes some units which may not be developed at locations authorized, but which may be reprogramed to other locations or canceled.

Cost

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Total cost of units completed and under construction [1]	$372,097,686	$126,875,382	$687,752,082	$1,186,725,150
Average	16,498	16,268	16,236	16,320
Mortgage proceeds	351,468,752	122,547,662	654,944,239	1,128,960,653
Average	15,583	15,713	15,462	15,526
Private	172,523,276	91,600,910	450,834,041	714,958,227
FNMA	178,945,476	30,946,752	204,110,198	414,002,426
Appropriated funds	20,628,934	4,327,720	32,807,843	57,764,497
Average	915	555	774	794

[1] Initial contract amounts for privately financed projects under construction and current contract amounts for projects financed by FNMA.

THE SURPLUS COMMODITY PROGRAM

In order to meet requirements for family housing in foreign countries with a minimum expenditure of appropriated funds, the Department of Defense was authorized by section 407 of Public Law 765, 83d Congress, to construct housing of a total value not to exceed $25 million, utilizing foreign currencies obtained from the sale of surplus commodities made pursuant to Public Law 480, 83d Congress. Subsequent amendments increased the total amount of the authorization to $250 million, obligated the Department of Defense to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation from quarters allowances withheld from occupants of such housing, and authorized expenditure of a maximum of 25 percent of the total cost of a project from appropriated funds.

It has been the policy of the DOD to first explore the use of the surplus commodity program in meeting needs for housing in foreign countries, because exports of surplus agricultural commodities are

stimulated and dollar costs are held to a minimum. This program has to date produced in excess of 8,000 units of housing in the United Kingdom, Spain, France, Japan, and Italy. Additional construction is planned in the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, France, the Azores, the Philippines, Bermuda, Iceland, and various classified locations, depending on the availability of foreign currencies. The Department of Defense is requesting fiscal year 1960 authorization for an additional 3,444 units in England, France, and various classified locations.

A table indicating the numbers of units completed, under contract, and in the current execution program follows:

Department of Defense, surplus commodity housing program, cumulative report (status as of Mar. 31, 1959)

	Completed and occupied		Under contract [1]		Current execution program		Total	
	Units	Costs [2]	Units	Costs [2]	Units	Costs [2]	Units	Costs [2]
United Kingdom	1,509	$15,130	822	$11,015	854	$11,443	3,185	[3] $37,588
Italy			493	7,187			493	7,187
Spain	[4] 1,582	8,500	552	10,392	747	14,940	2,881	[3] 33,832
France			2,403	50,000	400	8,000	2,803	58,000
Morocco			140	3,602			140	3,602
Bermuda					180	4,000	180	4,000
Portugal (Azores)					135	2,000	135	2,000
Japan	1,277	13,375	36	398			1,313	13,773
Iceland					50	2,000	50	2,000
Philippines					500	11,150	500	11,150
Total	4,368	37,005	4,446	82,594	2,866	53,533	11,680	173,132

[1] Includes certain units which are part of a contract but which are completed and occupied.
[2] In thousands of dollars. Includes as much as 25 percent appropriated funds in most projects.
[3] Does not include costs of community facilities which total approximately $3,900,000 in the United Kingdom and $.2M. in Spain.
[4] 1,582 units leased for a period of 7 years.

United Kingdom

Completed projects include a total of 1,509 units. An additional 822 units are under construction, and funds have been allocated for another 732 units, which should be placed under contract shortly. The bulk of the program is for Air Force personnel, with a small number of units for Army and Navy. Community facilities include schools and chapels, for which $3.9 million has been allocated. An additional 1,404 units and community facilities at various locations in Great Britain have been proposed for fiscal year 1960 authorization.

Italy

The project for 493 units in Italy has been placed under contract and it is expected that these units will be completed in the near future. A second increment of 133 surplus commodity units and various community facilities is planned for execution in Italy in fiscal year 1960 to be financed from the proceeds of a Public Law 480, title I, sale of surplus commodities to Italy.

France

The initial program of 2,700 housing units at 19 locations in France was financed with the proceeds of a "barter" sale conducted by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the authority of its Charter Act. The number of units was cut in late 1959 owing to a reduction of 297 units at Chateauroux. An additional 400 units for France

(298 Army and 102 Air Force) were authorized in fiscal year 1959; part of the French francs required for these units have been generated by Public Law 480 sales, and the balance is expected to be generated shortly. An additional 700 units for France (400 Army and 300 Air Force) is proposed for fiscal year 1960 authorization.

Spain

The total surplus commodity housing program in Spain constitutes 2,881 units. Of these, 1,582 units of rental guarantee housing have been inleased for the Air Force at Madrid, Sevilla, and Zaragoza. Although this project was initiated as a rental guarantee project, it was later converted to a surplus commodity transaction since a prepaid lease was executed for 7 years payable principally in Public Law 480 pesetas. In addition, the Air Force has 92 units virtually completed, 80 units under construction, 465 under design, and 271 units deferred pending reevaluation of need. With respect to Navy projects, 334 units at the Naval Air Station, Rota are expected to be completed by December 1959. In addition, 46 surplus commodity units at the U.S. Naval Magazine, Cartagena are presently under construction and 11 surplus commodity units at the U.S. Naval Magazine, El Ferrol are under design. An additional 140 units for 7 Air Force aircraft control and warning stations in Spain is proposed for fiscal year 1960.

Japan

The original project of 1,700 units of family housing to be built at Army, Navy, and Air Force installations in Japan was reduced to 1,313 units as a result of redeployment of U.S. forces in Japan. Of these units, 1,277 have been completed and 36 are still under construction. One hundred and fifty-seven additional units, plus various community facilities, are planned during fiscal year 1960 to support a specialized Army program.

Morocco

The original plan for 500 units of family housing for the Air Force and 330 units for the Navy in Morocco has been substantially curtailed because of local problems. The 330 units for the Navy have been canceled and the Air Force program has been reduced to 140 units, of which 100 units are under construction at Ben Guerir and 40 units at Sidi Slimane. The Air Force program involved the purchase of 500 prefabricated houses from Austria, paid for with Public Law 480 schillings. Manufacture of these houses is virtually complete, and in view of the Moroccan cutback, 360 of these prefabs will be stored at Trieste for eventual use at other locations in the Mediterranean and the Near East.

Turkey

The initial increment of 250 units of family housing in Turkey was planned for execution as appropriated funds construction pursuant to the authorization contained in section 301, Public Law 85–685. However, since erection of 360 prefab units of housing in Morocco has been terminated because of local problems, it is now planned to utilize the above appropriated funds authorization to erect 250 of these units, which are being stored in Trieste, at two locations in Turkey under the surplus commodity program. (The remaining 110 units will be erected in Crete under the fiscal year 1960 surplus com-

modity program; see below.) An additional increment of 600 units of family housing is planned for execution at two locations in Turkey during fiscal year 1960, utilizing foreign currencies generated by the sale of surplus commodities.

Crete

One hundred and ten prefab units, which were obtained originally for erection in Morocco, are proposed for fiscal year 1960 authorization in Crete under the surplus commodity program. These units all in support of an Air Force program at this location.

Azores

The first increment of 135 units of a program of 306 units of surplus commodity housing in the Azores is well underway. Design has been completed, the project is being advertised for bids, and a contract is expected to be awarded during July 1959. This project will be funded from the sale of surplus commodities to Portugal. It is anticipated that a project for the remaining 171 units will be executed during fiscal year 1960, financed through the proceeds of further Public Law 480 sales.

Bermuda

The initial 180-unit increment of a 300-unit program in Bermuda is presently under design and it is expected that a contract will be awarded in the very near future. These units will be financed from proceeds of a title I sale of surplus commodities to the United Kingdom.

Iceland

The initial increment of 50 units of housing in Iceland is currently under design. These will be financed with the proceeds derived from the sale of surplus commodities to Finland where prefabs will be obtained, with the work of erection and other site costs to be paid primarily from the sales of surplus commodities to Iceland.

Philippines

A surplus commodity program of 900 units has been authorized for accomplishment in the Philippines. Arrangements for financing the first increment of 500 units is presently being developed and it is anticipated that these arrangements will be concluded during fiscal year 1960. Because of the limited pesos which can be generated through title I sales to the Philippines, it will apparently be necessary to develop third country transactions to obtain the balance of the currencies required.

Commodities utilized

It is almost never possible to say precisely what commodities have gone into specific housing projects. Generally, a commodity sales agreement with a given country covers the movement of a variety of commodities, and provides for a variety of uses of the proceeds. Attached is a list of the countries where surplus commodity funds have been obligated for housing projects, showing in summary the commodities sold, the quantity of each, and the price paid by the receiving country.

Countries where surplus commodity housing projects are programed (through Dec. 31, 1958)

Commodities	Quantities	Value
Reserved for housing: $1,500,000.		
1. Austria (for projects in Morocco):		*(Millions)*
Wheat and flour ---- bushels	4,092,000	$6.9
Feed grains ---- do	11,277,000	15.3
Cotton ---- bales	65,800	10.5
Tobacco ---- pounds	7,519,000	4.8
Fats and oils ---- do	19,449,000	2.4
Fruits (dried and canned) ---- do	1,299,000	2.0
Ocean transportation		3.3
Total		43.4
Reserved for housing: $8,700,000.		
2. Finland (for projects in Iceland):		
Wheat and flour ---- bushels	6,097,000	10.8
Feed grains ---- do	1,458,000	2.3
Cotton ---- bales	49,600	8.6
Tobacco ---- pounds	20,802,000	12.3
Fruit ---- do	16,866,000	2.3
Ocean transportation		2.6
Total		38.9
Reserved for housing: $2,000,000.		
3. France:		
Cotton ---- bales	162,100	23.1
Tobacco ---- pounds	11,128,000	6.5
Ocean transportation		.1
Total, Public Law 480 sales		29.7
Reserved for housing: $6,000,000.		
Cotton (barter) ---- bales	373,756	46.7
Wheat (barter) ---- bushels	1,988,156	3.3
Reserved for housing: $50,000,000.		
4. Italy:		
Wheat and flour ---- bushels	896,000	1.5
Feed grains ---- do	4,926,000	6.3
Cotton ---- bales	536,100	85.5
Tobacco ---- pounds	19,304,000	14.9
Fats and oils ---- do	258,968,000	38.6
Poultry ---- do	2,858,000	1.0
Ocean transportation		5.3
Total		153.1
Reserved for housing: $12,700,000.		
5. Japan:		
Wheat and flour ---- bushels	30,979,000	48.6
Feed grains ---- do	11,325,000	14.4
Rice ---- hundredweight	2,142,000	13.7
Cotton ---- bales	319,300	52.8
Tobacco ---- pounds	9,792,000	7.7
Ocean transportation		13.3
Total		150.5
Reserved for housing: $24,500,000.		
6. Pakistan:		
Wheat and flour ---- busbels	72,657,000	123.6
Rice ---- hundredweight	10,225,000	65.2
Cotton ---- bales	174,400	30.7
Tobacco ---- pounds	5,777,000	4.8
Dairy products ---- do	10,117,000	4.9
Fats and oils ---- do	63,130,000	10.5
Ocean transportation		28.6
Total		268.3
Reserved for housing: $1,700,000.		
7. Portugal (for projects in the Azores):		
Wheat and flour ---- bushels	3,879,000	6.3
Ocean transportation		.9
Total		7.2

Countries where surplus commodity housing projects are programed (through Dec. 31 1958)—Continued

Commodities	Quantities	Value
8. Spain:		*(Millions)*
Wheat and flour ..... bushels	2, 598, 000	4.5
Feed grains ..... do	11, 673, 000	14.5
Cotton ..... bales	341, 600	59.6
Tobacco ..... pounds	17, 467, 000	11.5
Dairy products ..... do	4, 723, 000	1.0
Fats and oils ..... do	1, 023, 587, 000	166.6
Meats ..... do	66, 466, 000	16.8
Potatoes ..... do	50, 822, 000	1.4
Ocean transportation	.....	18.5
Total	.....	294.4
Reserved for housing: $19,200,000.		
9. United Kingdom:		
Tobacco ..... pounds	54, 030, 000	38.0
Fruits ..... do	101, 307, 000	10.2
Ocean transportation	.....	.4
Total	.....	48.6
Reserved for housing: $44,500,000.		
10. Yugoslavia (For furniture in other countries):		
Wheat and flour ..... bushels	134, 993, 000	228.5
Cotton ..... bales	431, 500	64.3
Fats and oils ..... pounds	336, 681, 000	46.7
Dry edible beans ..... hundredweight	225, 000	1.8
Ocean transportation	.....	49.5
Total	.....	390.8
Reserved for housing: $2,000,000.		
Grand totals:		
Total generated through commodity sales	.....	$1, 474.9
Total reserved for housing	.....	172.8

COMMITTEE VIEWS ON THE SURPLUS COMMODITY PROGRAM

Despite the efforts of the Defense Department, it is evident that this program is moving slowly. One example is in Great Britain, where further construction is impeded by the reluctance of the British to agree to additional Public Law 480 sales, a reluctance which is doubtless related to the move of the pound sterling toward free convertibility. This means that the British can buy such commodities as they want on the world market without the necessity for special international agreements.

Because of the limited interest of the French in the Public Law 480 purchases, the Department of Defense and the Commodity Credit Corporation jointly developed a "barter" transaction, under which $50 million of cotton and wheat were sold to third countries for various currencies which were largely converted into French francs, to produce 2,403 units of family housing for U.S. military personnel in France. However, the Defense Department reports that further transactions of this sort are not possible under revised barter rules.

The committee is also hopeful that the Department of Agriculture will revive the barter program with the view that this program can be reopened for the barter of surplus agriculture commodities for use in construction of military housing and related items overseas.

The curtailed program in Morocco involved a resourceful use of Public Law 480 Austrian schillings to buy prefabricated houses in Austria; and some of these are now scheduled for shipment to other

Mediterranean and Near Eastern areas. Similarly, the Iceland program involves use of Finnish prefabs purchased with Public Law 480 finnmarks. The Defense Department plans to continue use of Austrian and Finnish prefabs to the extent of the availability of schillings and finnmarks, and within the limits of practicality. For example, if the proper specifications can be met, and agreements obtained from the various governments involved, the Department plans to use prefabs in the Philippines, supplemented by "third country" currencies, pesos, and dollars.

The committee appreciates the increasing complexities involved in some of the surplus commodity housing programs, but expects the Defense Department to continue to exhaust every possibility in this field, prior to resorting to alternative programs.

THE RENTAL GUARANTEE PROGRAM

This program was first authorized by section 302 of Public Law 534, 82d Congress, and since July 1953, produced a total of 7,120 units in foreign countries: 4,838 units in France, 700 units in Morocco, and 1,582 units in Spain (later transferred to the surplus commodity program). The rental guaranty program provides foreign builders with guaranties of 95 percent of a stipulated rent schedule for a specific term of years, as an inducement to build and make available to U.S. military families acceptable housing at acceptable locations. The guaranteed rents averaged from $105 to $121 per month for periods from 5 to 7 years in France, and $110 per month for 10 years in Morocco.

The Department of Defense supports continued use of the rental guarantee program in areas where there is a highly developed local economy, and where the long-range stay of U.S. forces may be uncertain. Rents are paid by the individual occupants for housing allowances received. To date, the guaranty liabilities actually incurred by the United States have been relatively small ($486,000). A tabulation of the salient information on this program, projected through May 1959, is as follows:

Financial status of rental guaranty housing, May 1959

Locations	Units	Guaranty period; years	Monthly rental	Total scheduled rentals	Maximum contingent liability (95 percent)	Yearly reduction of liability	Liability to be retired by May 1959	Contingent liability as of May 1959
France A	1,210	5	$121	$8,784,600	$8,345,370	$1,669,074	$5,770,618	$2,574,752
France B	1,184	5	110	7,814,400	7,423,680	1,484,736	4,003,142	3,420,538
France C	2,444	7	105	21,556,080	20,478,276	2,925,460	5,934,920	14,543,356
France total	4,838			38,556,080	36,247,326	6,079,270	15,708,680	20,538,646
Morocco	700	10	110	9,240,000	8,778,000	877,800	1,963,800	6,814,200
Grand total	5,538			47,395,080	45,025,326	6,957,070	17,672,480	27,352,846

NOTES

(*a*) Public Law 534/82 authorized guarantees of this type up to $100,000,000.
(*b*) Amount available for support of new projects is now $72,600,000.
(*c*) France A covers contracts at Chateauroux, Orleans, and Petit Beauregard.
(*d*) France B covers package No. 1; 10 locations.
(*e*) France C covers package No. 2; 21 locations.

It will be noted that the bulk of the rental guarantee housing was built in France. There it has produced units which are small and relatively austere; but the committee is informed that they are generally far superior to anything available on the local economy. The program has provided sound, adequate shelter for thousands of American families.

The Defense Department proposes to use this program in areas where the surplus commodity program will not work, and has cited as examples Great Britain, where the commodity program is slowing down (as noted above), and Germany, where the deutsche mark is so strong that the Government has virtually no interest in international agricultural sales agreements. Several thousand units are urgently needed in Germany, and it is believed that local interests would build them on the basis of a short-term (5-year) guarantee.

The Defense Department requested not only that the $100 million rental guarantee authorization continue to be exempted from recission, but also that rental guarantee projects be included, with leased housing at tactical sites and Wherry acquisitions, in the exemptions from the requirement for line item authorization in an annual MCA act. The Department pointed out that these projects are built with foreign capital, are maintained and operated by foreign owners, and (except for the housing allowances which would be payable in any event) represent no cost to the United States, unless occupancy falls below the guaranteed level. It was stated that the projects therefore did not represent military construction. The Department further stated that, although first consideration is given to the surplus commodity program, it is not always possible to anticipate where the commodity program might fail and the rental guarantee program succeed, in view of the many complexities in both. In requesting an exemption from the line item requirement, the Department noted that rental guarantee projects are always cleared with the House and Senate Armed Services Committees in advance of execution of contracts, however there is no statutory requirement that this be done. In granting this exemption, the committee proposes to place a limitation on the number of such units that may be contracted for within the next 5 years.

LEASED HOUSING AT TACTICAL SITES

Public Law 161, 84th Congress, approved July 15, 1955, contained authority to lease 1,000 units of private housing in nearby communities for assignment as public quarters to military personnel stationed at tactical sites. Actually this legislation was proposed and supported by the Army and was intended for use for Nike launching sites of the Army Air Defense Command (ARADCOM). It was designed primarily for use in metropolitan areas where housing rents are apt to exceed by a substantial amount the quarters allowances of personnel assigned, and where continued availability of adequate (with respect to price and proximity to duty station) housing could be assured only by having such housing under lease. Leases are limited to 1-year terms.

This authority has been extended annually so that it now runs through fiscal year 1961 and the number of units was increased to 3,000 by Public Law 84–968, and to 5,000 by Public Law 85–241. As of December 31, 1958, 4,850 units were allocated to the Army, 25 to

the Navy and 125 to the Air Force. During the 3 months ending on that date, the Army had 4,285 units under lease at a cost of $1,698,465 for the quarter; recovery in the form of quarters allowances forfeited amounted to $1,147,660 or 67.5 percent of cost. Leases may not exceed $150 per month.

This leasing authority has proven to be in the best interests of the Government in that it permits requirements for family housing at tactical sites to be met by utilizing existing private housing to the greatest practicable extent, thereby reducing the necessity for constructing military quarters under appropriated fund or Capehart programs. (It should be noted that where there is no suitable housing and where no housing exists, it is still necesary to build housing under these programs, and authority for 575 Capehart units at Nike sites, as well as for 80 appropriated fund units, is requested in S. 1086).

Section 407 of this year's bill would extend this most beneficial authority through fiscal year 1962 and would increase the number of units from 5,000 to 7,500 in order to permit even further utilization at tactical installations of the Navy and Air Force as well as those of the Army.

RENTAL OF INADEQUATE QUARTERS

Section 407 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1957 (Public Law 85–241, Aug. 20, 1957) authorized the Secretary of Defense to make a determination as to the adequacy of public quarters under the jurisdiction of the armed services and to operate such quarters found to be inadequate on a rental basis. It required that rents be determined on a basis of comparability and that the difference between such rents and quarters allowances be paid in cash to the military occupants. It also required that such inadequate quarters be brought up to acceptable standards, or demolished or otherwise disposed of prior to July 1, 1960. Subsequently, section 516 of Public Law 85–685 (Aug. 20, 1958) extended the date for improvement or deactivation to July 1, 1961.

The military departments have virtually completed their review of potentially inadequate public quarters; of the more than 71,600 units evaluated, over 52,000 units have been determined to be adequate and are being continued as public quarters, while about 19,000 or 27 percent were found to be inadequate. Reasons for inadequacy were (1) deteriorated conditions, (2) structural and design defects, and (3) inadequate bathrooms, services or equipment; practically all of the inadequate units were found to be deficient under all three categories. Of the 19,000 units found to be inadequate, determinations of action to be taken have been made for 5,572. Of these, 1,641 units are to be rehabilitated and converted to permanent public quarters, and the remaining 3,931 units are to be demolished, sold, or converted to other use. It is expected that during the next year, determination will be made in regard to the rehabilitation or demolition of the remaining 13,500 units currently considered inadequate. A breakdown by services is as follows:

Substandard quarters (as of Oct. 31, 1958)

	Units subject to review for adequacy	Units determined adequate	Units determined inadequate	Units remaining to be reviewed
Army	8,904	1,647	7,246	11
Navy	18,967	14,055	4,825	87
Air Force	43,778	36,784	6,994	0
Total	71,649	52,486	19,065	98

Wherry Acquisition

Of the total of 83,727 units in the Department of Defense Wherry program, there have been a total of 54,176 units acquired as of March 31, 1959: Army, 14,409 units; Navy, 8,387 units; Air Force, 31,380 units.

In addition, the Army plans to acquire 2,443 units and the Navy 4,152 units prior to the end of fiscal year 1959 for a grand total of 60,771. During fiscal year 1960 the Army plans to acquire 2,038 units and the Navy plans to acquire 2,995 units. The Air Force has no further plans to acquire Wherry units. Rehabilitation and modification of acquired Wherry units is being accomplished as expeditiously as possible to make these units reasonably comparable to other public quarters. Funds for this work as well as for acquisition of new projects are made available from the Wherry revolving fund established for this purpose. The revolving fund is replenished from quarters allowances withheld from the occupants.

WHERRY TAXATION

Senate Report No. 1982, July 28, 1958, discussed in some detail the problems which were then being faced by DOD with respect to local taxation of unacquired Wherry projects. The DOD had initiated a survey of all Wherry tax problems in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and determine the need for additional legislative authority.

The survey mentioned above was completed and the following data was reported by the military departments:

	Number of tax determinations	Accepted by local taxing authorities	Contested by local taxing authorities
Army	19	16	3
Navy	35	21	14
Air Force	19	16	3
Total	73	53	20

As additional Wherry projects were acquired, the number of contested cases has diminished, and it has therefore been determined that no new legislative authority is required in this area.

FUTURE PLANS

Referring again to the tabulation of military family housing requirements and assets included above, it will be seen that the projected worldwide deficit, after allowing for projects in the fiscal year 1960 authorization, is on the order of 300,000 units. However, the Department of Defense has emphasized that this figure does not represent a programing objective. A large portion of it (about 175,000 units) represents the various safety factors already discussed; and it is hoped that the supply of adequate private housing will increase as time goes by. The Defense Department expects that a continued program of about 25,000 units a year (worldwide) for fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1962 should meet the most essential requirements.

In these times of changing weapons systems and deployments, the committee indorses the concept of proceeding on the basis of conservative annual increments, for it is most likely that some of the projects which have been deferred for future programing may prove eventually to be unnecessary. In view of continued heavy military expenditures it is vital to eliminate all but the most essential charges.

The committee notes with approval Assistant Secretary of Defense Bryant's statement: "To a degree, therefore, our emphasis has shifted from meeting a known sizable deficit to a more intensive screening of additional requirements." At the same time, it appears that emphasis should also be given to establishing uniform procedures for the management of the growing inventory of military-owned housing, and to identifying and (insofar as practicable) reducing the costs of maintenance and operation. Consideration should be given in future programs to planning and locating marginal projects (i.e., those which approach the top percentages) off base, with a view to maximum civilian use in the event they should become excess to military needs.

HOUSING COST COMPARISON—CAPEHART AND APPROPRIATED FUND PROGRAMS

In computing the cost of Capehart housing (time payment plan), consideration must be given not only to the cost of initial construction, but also to the cost of interest and mortgage insurance premiums over the 25-year amortization term. To compute the cost of appropriated fund housing on a comparable basis, consideration should be given to the cost of money to the Government, since it is fair to assume that Treasury borrowing would be increased to the extent that authorized housing is built with appropriated funds rather than under the time-payment plan. Moreover, expenditure of appropriated funds is required in connection with Capehart housing and the cost of borrowing such funds must also be considered.

If we assume that initial construction costs were identical under the two programs, then the total cost of Capehart housing would be greater than the total cost of appropriated fund housing because of the

difference in financing costs. This is shown in the following hypothetical unit comparison:

Cost items	Capehart housing	Appropriated fund housing
Total development cost	$28,871	$27,010
On-site costs [1]	16,200	16,200
Interest on principal [2]	10,807	9,543
Mortgage insurance premium [3]	597	0
Off-site costs [4]	800	800
Interest on off-site costs [5]	467	467

[1] Covers house, including range and refrigerator, and all on-site improvements, such as streets, sidewalks, landscaping and utility distribution systems.
[2] Computed on the basis of 300 monthly payments over a 25-year term; rate for Capehart is 4½ percent as specified by current FHA rules and regulations; rate for appropriated fund is 4 percent, the current cost of long-term Treasury borrowing.
[3] Based on one-fourth of 1 percent of declining balances.
[4] Covers site acquisition and preparation and off-site utilities and access roads.
[5] Based on 4 percent rate, the current cost of long-term Treasury borrowing.

Thus, the additional cost of a Capehart housing unit is shown to be $1,861—$1,264 for interest and $597 for mortgage insurance. Of course there are other minor differences, but these are compensating to some extent and the net effect is not significant in relation to the total development cost.

Under existing statutory cost limitations and DOD regulations and development procedures, however, a comparison of construction costs for Capehart and appropriated fund housing cannot be realistic. While an accurate estimate of the cost of a typical Capehart unit can be made, a comparable evaluation cannot be made under the appropriated fund program, which in recent years has been used only under exceptional circumstances, such as where small projects in isolated locations are required, where title is not adequate for Capehart mortgaging, where housing for higher rank officers is needed, and in certain overseas areas. Moreover, there are marked differences in the division of cost segments under the two programs.

Under the Capehart program, for example, the cost of dwellings and other improvements, such as streets, sidewalks, landscaping and utility distribution systems to the boundary line of the project site, are limited by statute to $16,500 per unit (Public Law 84–1020, sec. 505); the costs of site acquisition, rough site preparation and off-site utilities are limited by statute to an average of $1,000 per unit (Public Law 82–155, sec. 505).

On the other hand, under the appropriated fund program, the costs of the dwelling and utilities to a line 5 feet from the house are limited by statute from $13,200 for enlisted men to $22,000 for general and flag officers (Public Law 85–852, sec. 610); the costs of utilities and improvements beyond the 5-foot line and rough site preparation are not limited by statute and sites may be acquired under separate authorization and funding.

These differences are shown by the following chart:

CAPEHART HOUSING	APPROPRIATED FUND HOUSING
Limited to average of $16,500 per unit:	Various limits: [1]
Dwelling costs:	Dwelling costs:
Construction	Construction
Heating system	Heating system
Cooling system (if any)	Cooling system (if any)
Range	Range
Refrigerator	Utilities to 5-foot line
FHA commitment fees	No limit: [2]
Other improvement costs:	Other improvement costs:
Streets, sidewalks, curbs and gutters	Streets, sidewalks, curbs and gutters
Utility distribution	Utility distribution
Landscaping	Landscaping
Limited to average of $1,000 per unit:	Site preparation
Site preparation (rough)	Off-site utilities
Off-site utilities	Access roads
Access roads	No limit (site acquisition)
Site acquisition	

[1] Limits are: Generals or equivalent, $22,000; colonels or equivalent, $19,800; lieutenant colonels and majors or equivalents, $17,600; captains, lieutenants and second lieutenants or equivalents, $15,400; enlisted men, $13,200; in Alaska and oversea locations, maximum cost per unit is $40,000 with average cost of $32,000. Typical distribution of 1 general, 5 colonels; 30 lieutenantcolonels and majors; 164 captains, lieutenants and second lieutenants; and 300 enlisted men; in a 500-unit project, costs based on specified maximums for the continental United States would average $14,270 per unit.

[2] These costs usually approach $3.000 per unit for a large project, and run considerably more for smaller ones.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. As previously stated, maximum dependency should be placed on community support for housing requirements equaling 45 to 50 percent. This may be judged by considering local conditions in light of the size and mission of the installation in question. Experience has indicated that in approximately 50 percent of all instances, the community can supply support to the extent indicated. In establishing this 55 percent benchmark, the committee does not intend that it be considered either a maximum or minimum criteria, but a guide for closer scrutiny when requirements exceed 45 to 50 percent of estimated need.

2. In no instances should combined community support and programing exceed 90 percent of estimated requirements, even in isolated areas.

3. In absence of unusual circumstances, additional housing units should not be approved until prior increments are substantially completed in order that the impact on the local community can be appraised. This is particularly important in urban areas.

4. No approval should be granted for housing units where there is doubt about the continued use of the base in question.

5. *Capehart housing.*—The $16,500 limitation per unit for Capehart housing should be considered a maximum limitation to permit construction of suitable housing in high-cost areas, and not as a standard for all units. The committee is concerned over the fact that the cost per unit is not always scaled downward where construction is in a low-cost area, but rather a more elaborate house is built. The committee feels all units should be as comparable as possible as to accommodations irrespective of location. The committee further desires that more care be taken to maintain a reasonable balance between

the unit (square foot) cost of housing for senior grade officers and housing for junior grade officers and enlisted personnel, in order to avoid penalizing the accommodations provided for the latter.

6. In the report on the construction bill last year (fiscal year 1959), it was estimated from facts available that maintenance and operations costs for Capehart housing for the Department of Defense as a whole would probably average $75 per month. It is understood that for housing projects operated by private industry, $35 to $40 per month is considered more than sufficient for this purpose. The Secretary of Defense should give this matter close scrutiny to assure that maintenance and operating costs are reduced to an absolute minimum.

7. The committee has authorized 23,665 units of Capehart housing, which includes all such units approved by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. However, the committee has serious doubts as to the firmness of many of these requirements. The Secretary of Defense should carefully review the entire program to assure that only essential requirements are met, with preference being given to requirements in isolated areas.

The committee therefore desires that not more than 21,500 units of Capehart housing authorized in this bill be contracted for during fiscal year 1960. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or their designee, shall report to the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives which units are selected for construction. In arriving at this conclusion, due consideration has been given to the carryover of an estimated 5,000 units which were authorized in prior years but have not yet been placed under contract.

8. *Appropriated fund housing.*—The committee has long contended that it is more economical to build appropriated fund housing than Capehart units if such units are built on a comparable basis, using the same criteria and ground rules. As is clearly indicated above, there would be an ultimate savings of $1,861 per unit in interest and mortgage insurance alone.

By simple division it can be seen from the tabulation appearing earlier in this report that the 19,301 units of appropriated fund housing built since July 1, 1952, have cost on an average of $17,200 per unit as compared to $16,292 per unit for Capehart. While it is recognized that appropriated fund housing has been reserved primarily for exceptional circumstances such as for small projects in isolated locations, it can also be seen from the above comparison that there is a considerable difference in ground rules relating to these units.

The committee is of the definite opinion the Secretary of Defense should have the appropriated fund housing program closely scrutinized to see that it is brought more closely in line with the unit cost of the Capehart program. If additional legislation is necessary to accomplish this, the committee wishes to be advised.

9. Likewise, a close scrutiny should be made to assure that the same criteria for heavy construction is not applied to housing construction which in effect is unnecessary and runs up the cost factors, and that the projects are not overburdened with overhead charges of the construction agency. In summary, the committee is of the opinion that in part, the cost of appropriated fund housing is increased due to excessive overhead costs, refinements, and overloading of criteria.

10. *Rental guarantee housing.*—While the committee has not looked with favor on rental guarantee housing, it recognizes that in some countries where the need is greatest, it is not always possible to arrange for commodity credit housing and the uncertainty of occupancy precludes the use of appropriated fund housing; therefore, it is necessary to utilize the rental guarantee program. At present, some guarantee periods run from 5 to 10 years. It is the desire of the committee that no further contracts be entered into where the guarantee period exceeds 5 years, or not more than the period equaling the base rights agreement, if for a lesser period than 5 years.

The committee agrees that a degree of administrative flexibility is necessary in the development of nonappropriated funds programs in foreign countries, but has some reservations about the contention that rental guaranty projects are not military construction. Certainly they are built in support of military activities, and the guaranty liability, though minimum and contingent, would represent an actual cost to the United States if the related activities are sharply curtailed. Moreover, the requirement for Armed Services Committee clearances is contained in the legislative history of the program, and not in any specific legislative language. Accordingly, in order to maintain congressional control over what is built, the committee has added to section 408 of the bill a proviso limiting the number of units that may be contracted for during the next 5 years to 5,000.

Real Estate

A summary of the real estate acquisitions proposed in titles I, II, and III of the bill is shown in the following tabulation:

	Fee acquisition (acres)	Fee cost	Easement acquisition (acres)	Easement cost	Total cost
Army	1,147.28	$294,000	0	0	$294,000
Navy	1,864.31	1,085,000	704.00	$62,000	1,147,000
Air Force [1]	1,563.11	850,000	583.47	214,000	1,064,000
Total	4,574.70	2,229,000	1,287.47	276,000	2,505,000

[1] Land and dollars, in addition to that shown above, will be required for SAGE and missile construction at various locations where the exact acreage and cost have not yet been established.

The real property acreage under military control in the United States as of June 30, 1958, consists of the following:

	Acres
Fee owned	7,014,760
Public domain	16,673,234
Temporary use	1,151,147
Leased	1,871,640
Easements	85,628

The above total of approximately 26.8 million acres reflects a decrease of 2 percent, or about 550,000 acres less than reported for the period ending June 30, 1957.

The Department of Defense during the first cycle of its real property review program (August 27, 1955 to March 1, 1959) has determined as excess within the meaning of the Federal Property and

Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, a total of 531 installations, or portions thereof, consisting of 1,921,311 acres of land, representing an acquisition cost of $1,005,839,000. The committee understands that altogether, the property so determined and that which is currently being examined within the Department of Defense consists of 6,063,000 acres of land on 699 separate installations, which represent an acquisition cost of $1,673,857,842. Eighteen installations were transferred to other military departments for use as a result of the review program. The foregoing compares with land acquisitions for fiscal years 1956–58 and approved land acquisition expenditures for fiscal years 1958 and 1959 (to March 1, 1959) of only $102,633,157. This comparison is proof of the effectiveness of the real property review program as it is administered by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations). This accomplishment is due in large part to coordinating the review program with approved national policies and objectives, unified long-range military plans, and authorized force levels. This approach insures, insofar as is possible, that true operational requirements are given priority over marginal ones and that additional facilities are not acquired for obsolescent weapons systems.

The committee concedes that it is most difficult to realine our military installation complex to meet requirements during periods of rapid technological change. This is understandable when it is recognized that a majority of our installations were acquired to meet World War II and prior era requirements. A result of this is that a number of installations have become obsolescent and because of physical and functional limitations do not lend themselves to conversion for new missions. Whenever it is feasible and economical, however, installations which are no longer required or which are not suitable for assigned missions, are converted to other long-range utilization.

The committee is pleased that, in order to insure maximum use of existing assets, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) has assembled under his cognizance a pool of installations not in active use. This assemblage of installations is being augmented by a listing of all outgranted land and vacant or unprogramed permanent and semipermanent building space located on active installations. Screening of this assemblage by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) and by the military departments should assure that existing facilities are utilized to the maximum extent possible in lieu of new land acquisition and new construction. Actually, this screening process has been conducted by the Assistant Secretary's office since 1955, through use of the "Inventory of Military Real Property," however, the method described herein should result in a more precise and thorough process in the future.

The committee is pleased to note the results being obtained in using existing facilities in lieu of new land acquisition and construction. Some examples of these results are: Existing installations will be used as support facilities for all new missile projects in this year's program; through transfer of Parks Air Force Base to the Army the latter department was enabled to excess Camp Stoneman which not only required heavy maintenance costs, but was located on extremely

valuable real estate; Navy use of Vincent Air Force Base eliminates the necessity of constructing, by increments, what would ultimately have become a new naval air station at Mojave; Campbell Air Force Base, Ky., is being transferred to the Army, reducing the Army's requirement for airfield and supporting facilities at Fort Campbell; the Naval Industrial Reserve Aircraft Plant, Bronx, N.Y., is being utilized by the Army in lieu of constructing a new 1,400-man reserve armory; land at Fort Custer, Mich., is being transferred by the Army to the Air Force to provide a site for Capehart housing; the Naval Industrial Reserve Plant, Mineola, N.Y., is being utilized by the Navy in lieu of constructing new facilities for the Naval Training Devices Center; portions of Twin Cities Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn., and the Elwood Ordnance Plant at Joliet, Ill., are being converted from conventional ammunition manufacturing and loading to the production of warheads for missiles.

Although each inactive installation is screened thoroughly as to suitability for new activities, it must be recognized that a certain number do not lend themselves to economic and efficient conversion and must be closed or excessed. In addition, changing requirements and new weapons systems generate a need for the acquisition of additional real estate for operations even though existing installations are utilized for support activities. During fiscal year 1960 the lengthening of existing runways and the construction of missile launching sites will be the principal reasons for new land acquisition.

While the committee is pleased with the progress that has been made in disposal of surplus real estate and the utilization of existing facilities in lieu of new land acquisition and construction, it urges that this vital program be accelerated in every possible way to ensure that all real estate holdings, surplus to military requirements, will be returned to the tax rolls at the earliest opportunity.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS BY BID

Except under unusual circumstances, all contracts are being awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, and during fiscal year 1958, 96 percent of all work placed under contract was handled in this manner. The committee is pleased to advise that every effort will be made to continue the practice of advertising for bids on the open market. Reports on this important aspect of our contracting activity will continue to be made to the committee semiannually, as outlined by section 405 of this bill, and by similar provisions in previous legislation. Placement of contracts by negotiation will be utilized only where such procurement is in the interest of national defense.

Comparative percentage of competitive bid contracts versus negotiated contracts for all Department of Defense military construction during the past 5 years

	Percentage of work performed by—	
	Competitive-bid contracts	Negotiated contracts
Fiscal year:		
1954	93	7
1955	80	[1] 20
1956	91	9
1957	91	9
1958	96	4
1959 [2]		

[1] The high percentage is mainly due to the DEW line construction contracts.
[2] The data covering contract awards for the first half of fiscal year 1959 will not be received from the various worldwide field commands until Mar. 31, 1959. At that time, the customary report on contract awards for the first half of fiscal year 1959 will be submitted to the Congress, as required by sec. 506 of Public Law 85-685.

Title I—Army

Title I (Army):	
Inside continental United States	$65, 900, 000
Outside continental United States	24, 210, 000
Classified	81, 830, 000
Emergency construction	10, 000, 000
Total new authorization	181, 940, 000
Deficiency authorization (prior years)	1, 186, 000
Total authorization	183, 126, 000

SUMMARY OF THE ARMY PROGRAM

The Army's fiscal year 1960 construction authorization request, as originally submitted to the Congress, totals $231,252,000 which was reduced by the committee as indicated above. This authorization is to a great extent a direct reflection of the importance and the scope of the Army's missions today. The most important of the Army's tasks include the maintenance of forces overseas in support of our national policies and international commitments with our allies, furnishing of surface-to-air missile defense for the United States and our forces deployed overseas, and provision of a mobile combat ready strategic force here in the United States for rapid reinforcement of our deployed forces in time of need. The Army's request within the budgetary limitations current for this fiscal year is designed to place the major emphasis on those areas of the Army's greatest national responsibility.

Broadly, the Army's requested authorization can be separated into 11 major classes of facilities, including the classified projects, contained in section 102 and the unspecified or emergency type general authorization contained in section 103.

A summarization of the authorization requested for each of the subdivisions follows:

Program by categories

[In thousands]

Category	Continental United States	Overseas	Total
1. Operational and training facilities	$13,757	$6,772	$20,529
2. Maintenance and production facilities	5,542	1,302	6,844
3. Research and development and test facilities	4,150		4,150
4. Supply facilities	3,689	3,991	7,680
5. Hospital and medical facilities	7,499	4	7,503
6. Administrative facilities	297	340	637
7. Housing and community facilities	14,223	7,543	21,766
8. Utilities and ground improvements	11,825	4,168	15,993
9. Real estate	204	90	294
Total	61,186	24,210	85,396
Classified	29,026	99,330	128,356
Sec. 103, locations unknown			17,500
Grand total	90,212	123,540	231,252

Contained within the 11 categories comprising the total authorization requested are facilities supporting certain functional activities which represent some of the Army's major missions. Among these are the surface-to-air missile program, support of overseas armies and task forces, and Army aviation activities. The weight of these programs, both in their relative importance among the Army's roles and missions as well as their proportionate dollar value in the total authorization requested, merits special emphasis in this report.

Surface-to-air missile program, $116,984,000

In the field of surface-to-air missile defense, the Army has been assigned a broad and vital role in the maintenance of an effective air defense complex which will protect our industrial and population centers, as well as our retaliatory forces and the field Army Forces at home and overseas. To reinforce its capabilities in this field and to expand them, the Army has devoted $116,984,000 of the total authorization requested. A major portion of this requirement, $67.5 million, is devoted to research and development and test facilities for the NIKE-ZEUS antiballistic missile defense system now under development.

To combat the bomber and air-to-surface missile threat the Army is making use of the three systems now in being or in production. These include the NIKE-AJAX, the NIKE-HERCULES, and the HAWK.

Additionally, there is now in process of development a third generation member of the NIKE family which promises to be the most formidable of our missile systems for defense of our industrial and population centers as well as our retaliatory forces. This weapon the NIKE-ZEUS is the only one active antiballistic missile defense system presently under development. For facilities in support of research development and test activities on the NIKE-ZEUS program the Army is requesting some $67,520,000. This sum coupled with $49,464,000 requested for construction of NIKE-HERCULES, HAWK, and missile master facilities in both the continental United States and overseas represents 50.6 percent of the total Army request.

The committee has deleted from this program some $17 million for further expansion of the NIKE-HERCULES program within the United States for reasons indicated earlier in this report.

Army aviation, $7,829,000

This year as last, the Army is making substantial contribution to the advancement and expansion of its aviation facilities. This field of the Army's activities is playing an increasingly important part in contributing to the Army's overall capabilities. The new and lethal missile systems which are rapidly becoming the backbone of the Army's striking power today require much more timely and far-reaching methods of target acquisition and designation than did the conventional artillery of World War II. In addition, in modern warfare enemy forces are expected to be highly mobile and fluid in their dispersion. Accurate, up-to-the-minute reports on enemy forces locations are therefore critical to the success of the field commanders fire missions. The Army, within limitations is developing a family of Army aircraft which fulfills missions of observation; airlift of troops and combat supplies in the battle zone, communications and battlefield surveillance, and battlefield casualty evacuation. These missions are separate and distinct from the broader responsibilities of the Air Force. Additionally, the Army is developing and testing new forms of aerial transport, including such projects as tilt-wing aircraft and the flying jeep. Even though the Army's aircraft are capable of operating in the field and continuing their missions from unimproved facilities, a higher degree of training facilities, housing and airfield facilities are required in peacetime to insure the maximum degree of combat readiness. These facilities provide for efficiency and economy of maintenance and operation, as well as reducing maintenance requirements and safety hazards.

In order to broaden and strengthen its capabilities in this field, the Army is requesting some $7.8 million in the fiscal year 1960 authorization request. This sum includes facilities for runways, taxiways, aircraft hardstands and apron, field-lighting systems, fueling facilities, maintenance hangars, and other auxiliary flight facilities. Army installations at which aviation facilities are requested in this year's construction request include Fort Belvoir, Va.; Redstone Arsenal, Ala.; Fort Rucker, Ala.; Fort Sill, Okla.; Fort Bragg, N.C.; Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; Fort Ord, Calif.; and Fort Huachuca, Ariz. In addition, the Army is requesting aviation facilities in support of the Southern European Task Force in Italy, the 8th U.S. Army in Korea, and at three Army installations in Germany.

Support of overseas armies and task forces, $35,582,000

In carrying out its assigned missions overseas the Army today is maintaining some 40 percent of its Active Army Forces in various areas of the world. To support these units in their tasks the Army is requesting, exclusive of surface-to-air missiles requirements, some $35.6 million or 17.8 percent of its total request.

The Army's authorization request for its forces overseas includes six major geographical or functional areas. These are:

(*a*) *U.S. European Command, $12,451,000*

The largest portion of this overseas request is devoted to support of U.S. Army Forces in Germany. This total of $12,451,000 includes

$10,338,000 for U.S. Forces in Germany, $1,973,000 for U.S. Forces in Italy, and $140,000 for training facilities for U.S. Forces in France. A large portion of facilities required in Germany is designed to augment the dependent school facilities in that area. A separate comment on this requirement is furnished elsewhere in this report. The remainder of the facilities requested in France, Germany, and Italy include aviation facilities, field training facilities for the installations of train fire ranges, additional tank and automotive maintenance facilities, ammunitions storage, basic utility improvements, and substantial additions to tactical reserves of petrolcum, oils, and lubricants for the 7th U.S. Army. In Italy, where the Army maintains the Southern European Task Force, a large part of the total requirement of $1,973,000 is designed to improve missile maintenance facilities and to augment ammunitions storage facilities necessary for the support of the weapons system assigned to that command. Additionally, a substantial part of the request is required for aviation facilities to support the Sky Calvery Battalion assigned as a supporting unit of the U.S. Army Missile Command.

(*b*) *Korea, $5,372,000*

In Korea where the Army maintains forces in support of its commitments to the United Nations and to guarantee the independence of the Republic of Korea, the Army is requesting some $5,372,000 in facilities. These facilities include various classified facilities required for the tactical deployment of units in that area, additions to petroleum reserve installations, maintenance and storage facilities, some medical and dental facilities including a hospital laboratory facility, and an aircraft maintenance center, plus bachelor officer quarters with a total capacity of 150 men.

(*c*) *Army Security Agency, $5,573,000*

An additional segment within the overseas portion of the Army's request is contained in the facilities requested to support operations of the Army Security Agency overseas. New or additional facilities are requested for this agency at five locations. These requests include $3,531,000 for installation of a triservice processing center in Okinawa together with ancillary operating facilities necessary to the accomplishment of the mission of the station. Included among the facilities requested for this location are a triservice processing center building, an addition to the operations building, motor pool and post engineer facilities, a general purpose warehouse, barracks and mess facilities, and a headquarters building. At another Army Security Agency location in Asmara, Eritrea, $1,458,000 is requested to provide enlisted men's barracks for 222 men plus 50 sets of family quarters requested for construction using appropriate funds. Appropriated funds financing of the family housing is required inasmuch as the isolated character of this location makes utilization of any other type of funding impracticable.

At location 12, another Army Security Agency station in Japan, the Army is requesting $289,000 to finance the construction of vehicle storage sheds and a headquarters building. At location 321 in Korea the Army is requesting $185,000 for construction of an operations building and 3 enlisted men's barracks. The 5th Army Security Agency station for which facilities are requested is at location 276

a classified installation where the Army is requesting $110,000 to provide an access road to an existing airfield.

(*d*) *Army communications systems overseas, $4,392,000*

Another major segment of the Army's overseas construction request comprises $4,392,000 required to construct facilities in support of the Army's worldwide communications net. Five locations are involved in this request including four locations in classified areas, and the Army Strategic Communication relay station at Asmara, Eritrea. These facilities are all designed to reinforce and strengthen the dependability of the Army's worldwide communications system. Typical facilities included in this request are enlisted men's barracks with mess for Pacific Scatter System Station No. 2, additional FPIS electronic equipment and power for Pacific Scatter System Station No. 10, and additions to transmitter tape relay and communications center buildings at Aamara, Eritrea. The largest portion of this segment of the Army's request for installation of a new Pacific scatter station at location No. 12. This authorization request is in the amount of $2,799,000 and includes a communication equipment building, a barracks with bachelor officer quarters and mess, a terminal powerhouse, a utilities system, and emergency electric powerplant and vehicle storage facilities.

(*e*) *Pacific and Caribbean Commands, $1,794,000*

In the Pacific and Caribbean Commands the Army is requesting a total of $1,794,000 to permit installation of the modern small arms training ranges, trainfire, at locations in Panama, Hawaii, and Okinawa. The only other construction requested for these areas and contained within the total, is a chapel at Fort Schofield, T.H., where a pressing need exists for such facility.

(*f*) *Overseas forward depots, $6,000,000*

The last major segment of the Army's request for overseas construction is contained in projects to support construction of two forward depots, one in the European and one in the Pacific areas. These depots for which authorization is requested in the amount of $3 million each are designed to provide the establishment of two forward depot areas prestocked with relatively few but highly selective items of equipment and strategically located to provide prompt issue of supply in event of hostilities in the most potentially troublesome of the world's unsettled areas. The wisdom of establishing such depots has been amply demonstrated during the last year in the case of the Lebanon and Taiwan incidents.

With the exception of the classified authorization contained in section 102 and $17,500,000 of unspecified authorization requested in section 103, the remainder of the Army's request can best be distributed generally into nine broad construction categories, which by their titles epitomize the functional activities for which the facilities are required. Total and individual dollar values for these categories is contained in the preceding tabular summary of the total authorization requested by the Army. A résumé of the major facility requirements contained in these categories follows:

1. *Operational and training facilities*, includes various types of buildings, pavements, and ranges required either in military operations or training of individuals or units. This category totals $20,529,000,

distributed $13,757,000 in the continental United States and $6,772,000 overseas. Of this request $5,800,000 is for airfield pavements, taxiways, and airfield hardstands and aprons. Of this category $3,379,000 are communications, navigational aids, and airfield lighting. The balance of the category is composed of operational communication and training facilities in support of the Army's missions throughout the world.

2. *Maintenance and production facilities*, includes buildings and facilities from maintenance of all types of equipment and plant used by the Army including aircraft, missiles, tanks, guns, motor vehicles, electronic devices, and buildings. No industrial production-type facilities are included in this program. The total of facilities requested in this category is $6,844,000. Of this request $5,542,000 is within the continental United States and $1,302,000 in overseas installations. Within the United States the request includes $1,147,000 for five tank repair shops and facilities at Fort Knox, Ky., three missile battalion equipment parks at Fort Sill, Okla., in the amount of $748,000, and three missile maintenance equipment shops at Fort Sill, Okla., in the amount of $691,000. Additionally, the request contains facilities for a special weapons ordnance support battalion at Fort Sill, two battalion motor repair shops at Fort Bragg, and four motor repair shops at Fort Benning. Overseas the request includes maintenance facilities in support of 7th Army activities at 13 locations. Representative facilities included are aviation hangar with shop, a missile maintenance building, radio repair shop, parachute shop, post engineer shops, a tank maintenance shop, and various other maintenance facilities.

3. *Research, development and test facilities.*—This includes structures required for research and development programs of the Army. The total of this category is $4,150,000 and all of this construction is within the continental United States. Typical facilities included within this request are animal breeding buildings at Fort Dietrick, Md., radar and electronics test and instrumentation buildings at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., modifications to a rocket motor casting line at Redstone Arsenal, Ala., and a drone test facility and target simulation range at Fort Huachuca, Ariz.

4. *Supply facilities.*—These are defined as ammunitions storage, liquid fuel storage, open and covered storage areas, and refrigerated or cold storage facilities. The total of the facilities requested in this program is $7,680,000. Of this total $3,689,000 is within the continental United States and $3,991,000 is at overseas installations. Representative facilities within the United States included in this request are special weapons support facilities at Letterkenney Ordnance Depot, Pa., and Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill., supply and storage buildings at Fort Bliss, Tex., Fort Rucker, Ala., Fort Ord, Calif., and ordnance hardstands at Fort Knox, Ky. Overseas the requested supply facilities include petroleum tank storage in Germany in the amount of $2 million, ammunition storage facilities in Germany and Italy in the amount of $1,508,000, and cold storage facilities in the amount of $287,000 in Italy. Additional general purpose warehouse area and vehicle storage sheds in the amount of $196,000 are requested at two Army Security Agencies locations overseas.

5. *Hospital and medical facilities.*—This category totals $7,503,000 and includes $7,499,000 within the continental United States and

$4,000 overseas. The principal items within the United States included in this category are construction of 150 bed hospital at Fort Eustis, Va., in the amount of $4,366,000; air conditioning of the Fort Belvoir Hospital at Fort Belvoir, Va., in the amount of $748,000; and conversion of a building at Redstone Arsenal, Ala., to hospital use in the amount of $844,000. Authorization for the construction of certain hospital facilities has been held in abeyance by the committee for lack of realistic cost estimates. Additionally, funds have been requested for the construction of a recovery ward at Fitzsimons Hospital at Denver, Colo., in the amount of $110,000; alterations and additions to a hospital mess at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., in the amount of $180,000; and construction of a medical laboratory at Fort Meade, Md., in the amount of $1,251,000. The medical project requested overseas is for construction of a dispensary at Army Security Agency Location 03 in Okinawa in the amount of $4,000.

6. *Administrative facilities.*—This category comprises those buildings necessary for the administration of companies or larger units. The total of this category is $637,000, one of the smallest amounts of any of the categories included within the Army's request. It represents a commendable effort on the part of the Army to reduce their needs for this type of facilities to the minimum; $297,000 of this request is within the continental United States and $340,000 is requested for facilities in overseas areas. The facilities required within the United States are battalion headquarters and supply buildings at Fort Bliss, Tex., conversion of one additional floor of the Mart Building for the St. Louis Support Center at St. Louis, Mo. Overseas, the requested administration facilities are confined to two headquarters buildings required at Army Security Agency locations in Okinawa and Japan.

7. Housing and community facilities.—This includes all types of housing, family quarters, bachelor officer quarters, nurses quarters, enlisted mens barracks and all types of community facilities for morale, welfare, and recreation. This category including such a broad spectrum of facilities as it does, totals $21,766,000. Of this request $14,223,000 is within the continental United States and $7,543,000 is requested for overseas installations. Included within the total in the United States is $9,045,000 for family housing. The largest single segment of this family housing request is for 156 units of family housing at the U.S. Military Academy in the amount of $5,588,000. Additionally, $1,646,000 is requested for construction of 80 family housing units at various locations within the United States in support of the Army Air Defense Command tactical installations. Another 40 units of family housing is requested for Fort Greely, Alaska, in the amount of $1,811,000. Overseas the Army is requesting $1,117,000 to provide 4 units of family housing at Location 4 an Army Security Agency installation in Asmara, Eritrea. That portion of the request devoted to troop housing totals $6.2 million for troop housing in the continental United States and overseas. This sum includes $233,000 for permanent barracks to accommodate 56 enlisted women at Fort Lee, Va., and $1.2 million for permanent bachelor officer quarters spaces to accommodate 130 officers. The remaining $4.8 million will provide 2,109 semipermanent barracks spaces and 34 semipermanent bachelor officer quarter spaces at temporary installations in the continental United States and in overseas areas. It is to be noted that the com-

munity facilities, morale, welfare, and recreation structures represent a relatively small proportion of this request. The total of this type facilities requested by the Army is $5,336,000 both in continental United States and overseas. Of this sum only $931,000 is requested for the continental United States with the bulk of the request, $4,405,000 being programed for overseas installations where such facilities are notably lacking. Within the continental United States the Army is requesting a chapel at Fort Greely, Alaska, in the amount of $584,000 and a post office at Fort Knox, Ky., in the amount of $347,000. Overseas the major portion of the program, in excess of $3 million, is devoted to extension or additions to the Army's dependent school systems, mainly in Germany. In addition to those vitally needed facilities the Army is requesting a chapel, service club, theater, and post exchange in Okinawa for an Army Security Agency installation, a chapel at Fort Schofield, T.H., and a fire station at a U.S. installation in Italy.

8. *Utilities and ground improvements.*—The total of this request is $15,993,000. Of this sum, $11,825,000 is requested for installations within the United States and $4,168,000 for oversea installations. This category is comprised of such projects as electric power facilities heating plants, sanitary sewage systems, water supply systems, storm drainage, and roads and streets. Within the United States the Army's requesting $1,039,000 for extension or provision of electrical facilities at Fort Meade, Md., and Fort Leavenworth, Kans., $4,612,000 for expansion and rehabilitation of heating systems at Columbus General Depot, Ohio and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., $572,000 for the installation of sewage treatment plants at the Presidio of San Francisco, a storm drainage system at Fort Bliss, Tex., and an incinerator at Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Denver, Colo. The remainder of the program request is for the installation of water systems, roads and streets, and storm drainage systems at various locations within the United States. Overseas the sum of $4,168,000 is divided as follows $1,584,000 for electrical systems at Army communications stations throughout the world and at one installation in Germany; $1,696,000 for the installation of heating systems at three stations in Germany and one location for the Army Security Agency Overseas; and $888,000 for miscellaneous utilities, roads, and streets at various locations.

9. *Real estate.*—Acquisition of real property and real property site improvements. Land acquisition in the Army's fiscal year 1960 program has been reduced to the minmum. Aside from land required for antiaircraft NIKE installations in the continental United States there are only three land acquisition projects included. Two of these are in the United States and one in Hawaii. The total acreage proposed to be acquired by these projects is 1,147 acres at a cost of $294,000. The two projects within the United States are a proposal to acquire 600 acres at Fort Rucker, Ala., for construction of a stage field in the amount of $60,000 and a second project to acquire 487.2 acres in the amount of $144,000 at Baywood, Calif. Overseas the single land acquisition project proposed is that to acquire 60 acres of land at Halimano, T.H., in the amount of $90,000.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

Within the Nation's arsenal of missile ranges is the White Sands Missile Range, administered by the U.S. Army for use of all three of the military departments. Formerly known as the White Sands Proving Grounds, this range is the only one of the three national missile ranges which is completely over land. It is located between El Paso, Tex., and Albuquerque, N. Mex., and encompasses an area some 40 miles wide by 100 miles long. Its missions include provision of facilities and range support for research and development test, evaluation, and training firings for short and medium range surface-to-surface missiles, short and medium range air-to-air missiles, short and medium range surface-to-air and air-to-surface missiles and such early research and development portions of longer range missile systems as may be assigned.

The multiplicity and increasing complexity of the current missile programs within the three services demands the most comprehensive of long-range planning to avoid duplication of similar facilities. The White Sands Range has evolved a complex of flexible general purpose test facilities which assure range capabilities on a national requirements pattern. Overall planning and coordination should insure maximum joint utilization of facilities and interrange compatibility, plus reducing to a minimum the possible duplication inherent in special purpose test facilities.

Examples of the surface-to-surface missiles which have been tested at White Sands Missile Range are the LITTLE JOHN and HONEST JOHN rockets, the CORPORAL, SERGEANT, and REDSTONE guided missiles. Surface-to-air missiles include NIKE-AJAX, NIKE-HERCULES, and HAWK.

For the Air Force, firings at White Sands Missile Range include air-to-air firings and air-to-surface firings with ranges of less than 100 miles; they also fire, however, some surface-to-surface, high altitude test vehicles and drone and decoy missiles. Representatives of these are the FALCON air-to-surface missile, the AEROBEE hypersonic test vehicle and the MATADOR surface-to-surface missile.

Navy firings at White Sands Missile Range have included surface-to-air missiles such as the TALOS, the high altitude research vehicle, AEROBEE, and the POGO target.

Some measure of the increasing triservice capability and performance of this national missile range can be interpreted from the volume of the test firings now conducted there and the division of that workload within the three services. In 1951 when the Nation's missile capabilities were in a relatively elementary stage, less than 200 firings were conducted at the range. During fiscal year 1958 this load had increased to approximately 2,150 and is forecast to increase to an estimated 3,000 firings per year by 1961. Approximately 45–55 percent of the workload is Air Force, 40–45 percent Army and 5–10 percent Navy.

The committee notes that the development of the NIKE-ZEUS anti-ICBM missile by the Army will utilize to the maximum extent practicable the current assets at the White Sands Missile Range. While the longer range aspects of the NIKE-ZEUS system will understandably require utilization of the ocean ranges, many other phases of the research and development of this weapons system will

be evolved and tested at White Sands Missile Range. The Army is requesting some $4,020,000 in the fiscal year 1960 military public works authorization program to install facilities to accomplish this work.

TITLE II—NAVY

Title II (Navy):	
Inside continental United States	$110, 646, 000
Outside continental United States	29, 550, 000
Classified	18, 495, 000
Emergency construction	10, 000, 000
Total new authorization	168, 691, 000
Deficiency authorization (prior years)	640, 000
Total authorization	169, 331, 000

SUMMARY OF NAVY PROGRAM

The Navy's fiscal year 1960 construction authorization request as originally submitted to the Congress totaled $195,284,000, but was reduced by committee action as indicated above.

Several years ago the Navy, with encouragement by this committee, instituted a 5-year plan for the development of its Shore Establishment. Lone-range planning is not unique nor new to the Navy. Nevertheless, its utilization with regard to military construction and further refinement with each new program, have enabled the Navy to procure facilities for which it has had most urgent need.

The Navy's military construction is not a program per se. Rather, it has as its sole purpose the support of other Navy programs. All of these programs and, consequently, military construction, are required to improve the combat readiness of the operating forces of the Navy, including the Marine Corps. In the committee's analysis of the Navy's military construction program we have taken an objective approach, and have examined their expressed requirements from a policy viewpoint. This attack of the problem has not stayed the committee's close scrutiny of the details of each line item. Testimony has been taken on these and is on record in the transcript of the hearings.

The committee has recognized that many outside influences affect military construction. Action by a foreign country, or a combination of countries, may create an unpredictable situation bearing on military construction. This is only one example of numerous factors which may influence the program. Despite our acknowledgment of the effect of such actions over which the Navy has no control, we believe they affect only details, leaving the overall pattern of the Navy planning relatively stable.

This belief is confirmed by an analysis of the program. As originally submitted to the Congress, subject to subsequent service adjustments, each of the 195 specific line items for the 66 stations included in the program supports 1 or more of 4 broad objectives. A brief of these objectives and the support which they are provided by military construction are outlined in the following paragraphs.

1. Support of fleet operations, $123,101,000

The first major objective is to support fleet operations. Included for this purpose are 102 line items at 46 stations. This objective has the following components:

(*a*) *Support of the carrier striking force, $41,706,000*

There are 29 line items at seven station which support this subobjective. These are naval air stations at which operational aircraft are based. The proposed facilities are required for the efficient and effective operation of high performance jet aircraft. Carrier aircraft squadrons are based ashore on a rotational basis. This system has a number of benefits, among which are the opportunity for the pilots and crews to become indoctrinated in the operation and maintenance of new weapons and equipments, to become proficient in improved techniques; to sharpen their flying, bombing, and gunnery proficiency; and, in some cases, to live ashore with their families after prolonged tours at sea. Stations in this category are at Lemoore and Miramar, Calif., and at Oceana, Va., three of the Navy's master jet fields; and four strategic overseas stations.

(*b*) *Support of antisubmarine warfare, $8,804,000*

There are five line items at three continental and two overseas stations which support this subobjective. A major project in this category is the proposed breakwater at the Naval Station, Newport, R.I. Construction of this facility was planned only after extensive study by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Navy showed conclusively it is an economical and effective method of providing a safe harbor. By this means, ships moored at the two new piers will be protected from damage by waves whipped up during the frequent windstorms in the area. The ships may then shut down their powerplants for uninterrupted performance of needed maintenance. The thousands of man-hours thus saved will improve the combat readiness of these ships, the principal destroyer force of the Atlantic Fleet, enabling them to utilize these saved hours for patroling the seas.

Of the remaining four line items, two are for construction of facilities at classified locations for storage, assembly, and maintenance of ASW weapons. The committee has been apprised of the full details of these proposals. The other two line items are at naval air activities. One is at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.; the other is at an active overseas station. Both are to support operational aircraft used for reconnaissance and patrol missions.

(*c*) *Continental air defense, $20,638,000*

This category includes seven line items at two important overseas stations, one being at the Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada, the other being at a classified location about which the committee has been fully informed. Both of them are so-called barrier stations, being parts of the distant early warning system. Specifically, the line items will provide support for the airborne portion of the system.

(*d*) *Training, $23,015,000*

The most modern ships and aircraft and the most powerful weapons in the world would be of little avail to our country without the highly trained and skilled officers and enlisted men who make our Navy preeminent. Young men are commissioned or enlisted in the Navy or Marine Corps from all walks of life, from our colleges and high schools and from urban and rural areas of the country. They are trained in the various aspects of naval operations, from the elements

of seamanship to the complex science of naval warfare. Personnel who operate and maintain the equipment and weapons employed by a modern navy first gain knowledge and skills at training centers ashore.

To provide new facilities for this purpose or to modernize wornout existing facilities, there are included in this program 36 line items at 10 of the training stations. For example, facilities are to be provided at the Submarine Base, New London, Conn., where crews will receive team training in the operation of nuclear-powered submarines. Projects are in the program for the naval auxiliary air stations at Meridian, Miss., and Whiting Field, Fla. Here, at these two stations, aviation cadets will receive basic training in the T2J, the jet trainer aircraft which will be introduced into the Navy training system in the near future. Another major project will provide for replacement of deteriorated barracks at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill. The new barracks will give adequate living and studying space for naval recruits who will be gaining their first impression of the Navy in this environment. Additional facilities will be built at the Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P.R. This is the Navy's "east coast" training station where the fleet engages in guided missile operational training.

(e) Logistics, $28,938,000

This category embraces the broad field of support of the fleet, including the furnishing of supplies and services. There are 25 line items at 22 stations included in the program for this purpose. One of these line items will provide facilities at the Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, T.H., for the underground storage of aviation fuel. Other projects are at the Naval Shipyards, Portsmouth, N.H.; Boston, Mass.; and at Brooklyn, N.Y., where repair and replacement work will be done on existing facilities in order that naval ships may be drydocked for maintenance and overhaul, or, in the case of the Portsmouth yard, where new, nuclear-powered submarines may be built and moored. Other projects in this group are to provide facilities at a number of important communication stations, including Norfolk, Va.; Winter Harbor, Maine; Okinawa; and Londonderry, North Ireland.

2. Support of air and ground forces of Marine Corps, $8,380,000

The second major objective is to support air and ground forces of the Marine Corps. The program includes 18 line items at eight stations in support of this objective. A single line item at each of three air stations will provide facilities needed to furnish breathing oxygen to the Marine aviators operating from these fields at Beaufort, S.C.; El Toro, Calif.; and Kaneohe Bay, Oahu. Another of the stations providing support of the air forces of the Marines is at Yuma, Ariz. This former Air Force base, built during World War II for the operation of lighter, propeller-driven aircraft, is to be repaired and modernized for safe operation of the heavier and faster, high-performance jet aircraft. Facilities being provided for support of the Marine Corps ground forces are at three Marine Corps bases. A line item is included for improving the water supply system in the Yermo area at the Barstow, Calif., supply center. In addition, an atomic assembly and checkout structure, together with attendant magazines, are to be

provided at the Marine Corps bases at Camp Lejune, N.C., and at Twentynine Palms, Calif.

3. Support of guided missile program, $34,466,000

The third major objective is to support the guided missile program. This objective has two parts. The first part relates to the development of the Pacific missile range. Last year, the first increment of construction was authorized for approximately $14 million. The second increment is for 47 line items totaling $30,050,000. The project will provide for construction of various facilities at the headquarters at Point Mugu, Calif.; at Point Arguello, Calif., the naval missile facility; and at various Pacific islands from San Nicolas Island, approximately 60 miles off the California coast to Wake Island, approximately 5,000 miles westward. Further discussion of the Pacific missile range is contained elsewhere in this report.

The second part of this objective relates to the POLARIS weapon system. Nine line items at three stations in this program are required for POLARIS support. Two of the line items will provide facilities at two classified locations for direct support of the accelerated development of the POLARIS fleet ballistic missile. Another classified facility is at the Submarine School, New London, Conn. The remaining line items will provide communication facilities in Maine to be utilized in the overall POLARIS weapon system.

4. Support of research and development of the Navy, $9,022,000

The final major objective is to support research and development of the Navy. Nineteen line items at eight stations are included in the program for support of this objective. Among these are line items at the David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md., to provide facilities needed in the study of acoustics, leading to the reduction of noises in nuclear-powered submarines and other Navy ships; at the Naval Air Materiel Center, Philadelphia, Pa., where a line item is to be provided for research in the field of aircraft catapult and arrest components. A line item is also proposed for the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md., to install an arresting gear test facility. This facility is to utilize recently developed gear in order to test the capability of new carrier aircraft to withstand the stress and strain of abrupt deceleration. A major project in this group is for the development of base facilities at the isolated Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, W. Va. This will furnish living and working accommodations for the scientific and technical personnel assigned to this activity to operate the unique communication research facility now under construction.

PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE

The Navy's program includes a project of 47 various line items for the second increment of construction of the Pacific Missile Range. The first increment for development of the PMR was authorized last year in the amount of approximately $14 million. Planning for the foreseeable future calls for annual increments of $30 to $40 million for the next 5 or 6 years for construction of additional facilities.

The headquarters of the Pacific Missile Range is at Point Mugu, Calif. It is under the management of the Navy. It is being built to augment the Nation's capability for fulfilling test and training requirements of the IRBM, ICBM, satellite vehicles, and a host of other guided missiles and special devices.

Each of the three national ranges has unique capabilities which are complementary.

When the Secretary of Defense, in December 1957, approved the Navy proposal to expand the Naval Missile Center, Point Mugu, into a national range, the Pacific Missile Range began. At that time, the Secretary of Defense approved the transfer from the Army to the Navy of approximately 19,000 acres of land in the vicinity of Lompoc, Calif. This is the southern portion, approximately one-third, of the former Army Camp Cooke. The proposal to establish this national range resulted from the increased emphasis on missile and satellite projects during the past 2 years, and recognition of the necessity for adequate national range resources.

The newly acquired land was designated as the Naval Missile Facility, Point Arguello and, in June 1958, the Pacific Missile Range was officially established as a national facility with the Navy as executive agent. The mission is to provide range support for Department of Defense and other designated Government agencies in guided missile, satellite and space vehicle research, development, evaluation, and training programs.

In planning the development of this range, the Navy has reviewed all firm missile programs, all available information on plans for satellite and space vehicles and plans for the next 10 years. With this study as a basis, a long-range plan for future devlopment of the range was prepared. It envisages the establishment of a complex of ranges capable of supporting the various types of missiles and satellites to be developed. The complex would encompass the following six ranges: Sea Test Range—the sea areas adjacent to the west coast extending seaward for 500 miles. It will support the development of air-to-air, air-to-surface, and short range surface-to-surface missiles and fleet training with these missiles. IRBM Range—a sector extending westward to sea from the Naval Missile Facility, Point Arguello, for a range of 1,500 miles for IRBM training firings. Polar Orbit Range—to provide a capability to launch satellites southward from the Naval Missile Facility, Point Arguello, into polar orbit. This range is suitable for this purpose as no land mass exists southward from this facility. Equatorial Orbit Range—to provide a capability for launching satellites eastward from a yet undetermined island in the vicinity of the equator into an equatorial orbit. Antimissile-Missile Range—to provide a capability for launching antimissile-missiles from some yet undetermined Pacific islands against ballistic missiles fired as targets from the west coast. In addition, the range complex will include the Naval Missile Center, Point Mugu; the Naval Missile Facility, Point Arguello; various Pacific island installations, and instrumented range ships. Vandenburg Air Force Base is to the north and adjacent to the Naval Missile Facility, Point Arguello, but is not a part of the Pacific Missile Range. It is the northern two-thirds of the former Army Camp Cooke. It is an operational base under the Commander in Chief, Strategic Air Command. It is planned to have the capability of launching ICBM's against enemy targets. In addition, IRBM and ICBM training missiles can be launched from this Air Force Base into impact areas in the Pacific Missile Range.

Title III—Air Force

Title III (Air Force):	
Inside continental United States	$289, 746, 000
Outside continental United States	71, 759, 000
Classified	443, 541, 000
Emergency construction	15, 000, 000
Total new authorization	$820, 046, 000
Deficiency authorization (prior years)	2, 343, 000
Total authorization	$822, 389, 000

SUMMARY OF AIR FORCE PROGRAM

Military construction is basic to all Air Force programs. In fact, for many of the major operational programs, it is the initial phase in the programing and budgetary actions because of the long leadtime to produce completed usable facilities. In addition, because of the nature of new weapon systems and operational concepts, base facilities are increasingly an integral part of the weapon systems as in the case of the missile force and in the case of dispersal and alert for the bomber forces.

The bill as originally submitted to the Congress for the Regular forces, adjusted to reflect changes requested by the Air Force, amounted to $886,574,000. This amount was reduced by committee action as reflected above.

Authorizations are also requested in the bill for the construction of family housing in the United States under title VIII of the National Housing Act, and family housing and certain community facilities at oversea locations under the surplus commodity program.

Although primary emphasis in this fiscal year 1960 construction authorization program has been directed to the satisfaction of operational type requirements, it also continues at a slow rate the programs for improvement in personnel facilities and for replacement of substandard facilities.

The Air Force advises that military construction program is carefully integrated with the procurement, weapons, personnel, and operating programs. The authorization request has been developed with a realistic consideration of a required level of operational readiness, the need for continued modernization of the forces and their supporting base facilities, and the importance of maintaining a sound balance between immediate and long-term objectives.

According to the Air Force the development of the program has been controlled by several major considerations. First is support of the vital immediate and continuing need to maintain a capability, with bases in being, for immediate response to an aggression against the United States or its allies. This capability is the principal factor in achieving the deterrent objective of the Air Force.

Second, is the establishment of operational bases throughout the world from which the threats of limited wars can successfully be countered.

Third, is the integration into the Air Force of new weapons systems and capabilities for superior defense posture in the future. This must be accomplished within available and foreseeable resources, without an unacccptable degradation of current capabilities to deter or counter the opposing military threat.

Fourth, is the continuing and essential need, concurrently with the satisfaction of operational requirements, to alleviate existing deficiencies in the physical plant and to establish an adequate standard of living for personnel.

Last, is the relationship of base facility and construction requirements to future force and program objectives. It must be insured that facilities constructed are adaptable to long-range requirements or that the planned period of use is sufficient to warrant their construction.

To aid implementation of these construction considerations and as part of overall Air Force program, force, and budgetary considerations, a weapon-system approach has been applied in the analysis of requirements and programs. By this method, total costs for each of the various systems or program objectives are analyzed in respect to the capabilities produced by the respective systems or objectives. This type of analysis provides a more realistic method for selecting the most effective and efficient combination of forces and systems attainable within available resources, and for minimizing imbalances between weapons and their supporting components.

Program summary.—The following table summarizes the Air Force fiscal year 1960 military construction authorization request.

Inside the United States (sec. 301)	$329, 536, 000
Outside the United States (sec. 301)	75, 997, 000
Missiles and missile detection (sec. 302)	443, 541, 000
Unforeseen construction (sec. 303)	17, 500, 000
Total new projects	866, 574, 000
Public Law 85–241 authorization increase (sec. 305)	265, 000
Public Law 85–685 authorization increase (sec. 306)	2, 078, 000
Total prior authorization increase	2, 343, 000
Total increase in Air Force authorization	868, 917, 000

The total increase in Air Force authorization proposed for fiscal year 1960 is $868,917,000, which was reduced by the committee to $822,389,000.

Of the $866.6 million of new authorization requested in the bill, $329,536,000 represents projects at bases inside the United States and $75,997,000 are for projects outside the United States. In addition, the major portion of the missile and missile detection authorization of $443,541,000 will be utilized inside the United States.

Of the $76 million shown for outside the United States, $5 million are in U.S. Territories and possessions, and over $22 million are for projects on the North American Continent which directly contribute to continental defense. This leaves only $49 million, or less than 6 percent of the total program, for projects in foreign countries outside North America.

Sections 305 and 306 of the bill amend 2 prior years' authorization acts to increase authorizations granted therein for certain projects by a total of $2,343,000 to cover authorization deficiencies resulting from increased costs and low initial estimates.

The request for new authority provides for construction at 153 major installations, of which 104 are inside the United States and 49 are outside the United States. In addition, the program provides facilities at a number of other sites and locations, including aircraft control and warning network projects, facilities for the development, testing, and operation of missiles, and classified facilities at various overseas locations.

To accommodate adjustments being made in the composition of the forces and in base deployments, existing bases are being adapted to the extent that no new major bases will be initiated with fiscal year 1960 construction, although there are several new unmanned radar gap filler sites in the program.

Major command summary.—Following is a summary of the authorization request by major Air Force commands:

Sec: 301:	
Inside the United States:	
Air Defense Command	$31, 927, 000
Alaskan Air Command	20, 881, 000
Air Materiel Command	21, 162, 000
Air Research and Development Command	13, 870, 000
Air Training Command	16, 328, 000
Air University	2, 306, 000
Headquarters Command	21, 087, 000
Military Air Transport Service	3, 617, 000
Strategic Air Command	87, 215, 000
Tactical Air Command	14, 306, 000
Aircraft control and warning system	96, 837, 000
Total, inside the United States	329, 536, 000
Outside the United States:	
Military Air Transport Service	2, 249, 000
Pacific Air Forces	26, 143, 000
Strategic Air Command	8, 679, 000
U.S. Air Forces in Europe	16, 926, 000
U.S. Security Service	4, 908, 000
Special facilities	105, 000
Aircraft control and warning system	16, 987, 000
Total, outside the United States	75, 997, 000
Sec. 302:	
Ballistic missiles	374, 085, 000
Strategic missiles	10, 000, 000
Defense missiles	26, 000, 000
BMEWS	33, 456, 000
Total, sec. 302	443, 541, 000
Sec. 303: Unforeseen construction, total	17, 500, 000
Total, new authorization	866, 574, 000

Program objective summary.—Following is a summary of the authorization request by the major Air Force program objectives and weapon systems which the construction will support.

AIR FORCE

Summary by program objective

	Amount	Percent of total
Strategic forces	$483,928,000	55.8
Ballistic missiles	342,991,000	39.6
Satellite programs	33,180,000	3.8
Air-to-surface missiles	10,000,000	1.2
Bomber facilities	69,199,000	7.9
Tanker facilities	8,309,000	1.0
Strategic support	20,249,000	2.3
Air defense	229,213,000	26.5
Defense missiles	26,874,000	3.1
Interceptor facilities	23,173,000	2.7
Ballistic missile early warning	33,456,000	3.8
Aircraft control and warning	32,548,000	3.9
SAGE	90,661,000	10.4
NORAD Headquarters	10,000,000	1.2
Air defense support	12,501,000	1.4
Tactical forces	25,769,000	3.0
Tactical missiles	10,206,000	1.2
Tactical aircraft	10,315,000	1.2
Tactical support	5,248,000	.6
Military Air Transport	10,240,000	1.2
Transport aircraft	1,032,000	.1
MATS support	9,208,000	1.1
General support	117,424,000	13.5
Research, development and test	23,601,000	2.7
Training and education	12,806,000	1.5
Depot operations	7,625,000	.9
Overseas theater forces	35,797,000	4.1
Move of Air Force flying activities from Washington, D.C., area	19,990,000	2.3
Special facilities	105,000	.01
Unforeseen construction	17,500,000	2.0
Total	866,574,000	100.0

Construction for strategic forces.—The largest portion of the program, $484 million or over 55 percent of the total program, provides facilities in direct support of the strategic strike forces. This total consists of facilities for manned bombers and their supporting tanker aircraft, ballistic and air-to-surface missiles, and space satellite programs.

Ballistic missiles.—Over two-thirds of the facilities requested for the strategic forces, or $343 million, are for ballistic missiles. In the fiscal year 1959 and prior years' programs, construction was provided for research, test, and training facilities at various locations for both the intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles; development of the first six operational sites for the ATLAS ICBM; and initiation of construction for hardened operational TITAN ICBM sites.

The authorization requested in the fiscal year 1960 program will construct facilities for additional squadrons of the ATLAS ICBM. These sites will be constructed in a configuration which provides an increased degree of dispersal and protection and capability for rapid launch in event of an attack.

The ballistic missile authorization also provides construction for additional TITAN ICBM squadrons in a fully hardened configuration. In addition, certain technical support items will be provided at operational ICBM sites initiated under prior years' programs.

Also included in the ballistic missile amount are authorizations for the construction of test and prototype launching facilities for the MINUTEMAN solid-propellant ICBM.

Satellite programs.—$33 million are requested for facilities supporting various satellite programs for attack warning, reconnaissance, communications, and global weather surveillance. These facilities consist of launching sites, tracking and information acquisition sites, and control and data interpretation centers.

Air-to-surface missiles.—$10 million are included in the program to construct facilities for the HOUNDDOG and the QUAIL air-to-surface missiles carried by the Strategic Air Command bombers to provide them with greater penetration capability. This amount provides assembly, checkout, and engine test facilities at 15 B–52 bases inside the United States.

Bomber facilities.—Fiscal year 1957 construction authorization initiated a program of construction to adapt existing Air Force bases for dispersal of the squadrons of the SAC heavy bomber force. Through the fiscal year 1959 program, construction has been completed or is underway providing 22 of these B–52 dispersal bases. Added to the 11 bases which had been the homes for the original B–36 wings, these 22 additional bases would permit full dispersal by squadron of the then-planned 33 squadrons or 11 wings of B–52's.

The currently planned B–52 force has been increased to 14 wings and additional dispersal bases are needed. This authorization request proposes the provision of four additional B–52 dispersal bases by the conversion of existing B–47 installations (Homestead, Fla.; McCoy, Fla.; Larson, Wash.; and Schilling, Kans.) and includes $18.2 million for construction of facilities for that purpose.

By adjustment of the forces and attrition of B–47 units concurrently with the increase in the number of B–52 wings, a substantial degree of dispersal also is being achieved for the medium bomber wings. The bomber force facilities in this year's construction program includes a third major increment of construction, $21.5 million, at Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis., at which one of the first operational B–58 wings will be deployed.

The balance of $29.5 million for bombers principally provides operational types of facilities at dispersal bases previously programed to improve the capability and alert posture of the B–52 squadrons at those locations.

SAC tanker facilities.—In the fiscal year 1958 supplemental and fiscal year 1959 programs, authorization and funds were provided for construction which would permit the relocation of KC–97 tanker refueling squadrons from southern bases in the United States to locations in northern areas from which they can operate without delay in support of strike missions by the B–47 medium bombers. Under those programs 10 KC–97 squadrons are being relocated on 8 existing Air Force bases; $6.7 million are requested in this program to provide additional facilities to increase operational effectiveness of the KC–97's at 6 bases; $1.6 million of the tanker facilities amount provides additional construction at 1 KC–135 tanker base.

Strategic support.—The balance of $20.2 million for strategic support is distributed among a number of bases and consists of various operational and support facilities which directly support the strategic effort but are not associated solely with a single strategic system or objective.

Air defense.—Facilities for air defense, including both active defense and warning and control functions, amount to $229.2 million; or 26.5 percent of the total program.

Defense missiles.—A significant package within this defense grouping is that for the BOMARC missile, amounting to $26.9 million. Construction of facilities for this missile was initiated in the fiscal year 1958 construction program at four locations. Fiscal year 1959 authorizations provided facilities at 10 additional locations. This fiscal year 1960 request includes $26 million to construct 5 additional sites and $900,000 for support facilities at a previously programed site.

The BOMARC missile squadrons are being placed on or near existing Air Force or other military installations, with the main base providing the major portion of necessary support facilities, including housing.

Interceptor facilities.—The $23.2 million for interceptors provide principally operational and maintenance facilities at a number of bases to improve the readiness capability and effectiveness of fighter interceptor aircraft. A major portion of the items consists of shelters for the calibration of the interceptor weapons and shops for the maintenance of the extensive and sensitive armament and electronics equipment on the newer improved types of Century-series interceptor aircraft.

Ballistic missile early warning.—The Soviet advances in ballistic missiles have emphasized the need for a system to provide immediate warning of a surprise ballistic missile attack against this country. This is essential to the protection and response of our deterrent and active defensive forces. The Congress recognized this urgent need last year and authorized $189 million in the fiscal year 1958 supplemental construction program to proceed with development of a ballistic missile warning system. Construction of the system now is well underway. This fiscal year 1960 program contains $33.5 million of additional authorization to provide the balance of the facilities needed for the first operational sites.

Aircraft control and warning.—$32.5 million are requested to provide for expansion and improvements in the radar warning system. Almost $20 million of this amount is for the provision of increased electric power generating capacity at primary radar stations in North America. This increased power is required for the operation of new types of more powerful and longer range radar equipment being installed in the system. Also included in the warning and control package are 27 units of family housing at each of 5 radar sites inside the United States where community housing is not available for lease; 19 unmanned automatic gap filler sites in the United States; and freight terminals at several principal resupply stations on the DEW line to provide logistic support improvements determined necessary after experience gained in the first year's operation of the DEW line.

SAGE.—A substantial amount, $90.7 million, is requested for the SAGE (semiautomatic ground environment) system which provides the speed and accuracy necessary for air battle analysis and control and coordination of intercept actions with our defense missiles and interceptor aircraft. The major portion, $76.3 million, of the SAGE authorization amount will be utilized for the construction of a number of hardened facilities for the installation of solid-state (transistor) computers in super combat centers. Construction of these super

combat centers will substantially reduce the vulnerability of the SAGE system and will provide much greater capacities for air surveillance and weapons control. These tremendous improvements in air defense capabilities are possible as the result of recent developments in solid-state electronic elements, or transistors, and the application of transistors to computers, together with better computer techniques. They are the direct outgrowth of our research and development program and the application of commercial developments to the resolution of military problems.

The balance of the facilities requested for the SAGE system primarily provides communications receivers and transmitters and operations buildings additions at existing radar sites to tie them into the SAGE direction and control centers.

NORAD headquarters.—$10 million are requested to initiate construction of a hardened combat operations center in the Colorado Springs, Colo., area, from which the NORAD Command will direct and control the air defense of the United States and Canada. In this facility, the NORAD component force commands will perform their various functions which are directly related to tactical operations in support of the NORAD mission. The initial increment requested in this program generally will provide for necessary real estate acquisition, site preparation, rock excavation, and utilities and access roads. Subsequent increments will complete excavation work and construct the basic operations center structure and supporting facilities.

Air defense support.—The $12.5 million for air defense support, as in the case of the strategic support package discussed earlier, includes various types of facilities related to more than one weapon system. These projects, generally, consist of operational, aircraft maintenance, and personnel support facilities, and include $4.3 million for facilities needed to support the Air Defense Command fighter intercepter weapons employment center at Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla.

Tactical forces.—The program directly supporting the tactical forces amounts to $25.8 million, or 3 percent of the total authorization request; $10.2 million is devoted to facilities for tactical missiles, the major portion of which will provide hardened facilities for the MACE missile at oversea locations. Other projects for the tactical forces include $10.3 million for operational and aircraft maintenance facilities in support of tactical fighter, tanker, and transport aircraft, and $5.3 million for various support facilities at Tactical Air Command bases.

Military air transport.—Projects for military air transport activities total $10.2 million and consist of operational and support facilities related to MATS transport aircraft operations.

Research, development, and test.—$23.6 million are requested for facilities to support Air Force R. & D. programs. The principal projects include $5.7 million at Arnold Engineering Development Center to provide increased capabilities for development work associated with supersonic aircraft and missile engine components under such conditions as orbital speed, and $7.3 million for a laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base for research in sonic effects on flight vehicles.

Training and education.—The training and education package of $12.8 million includes $10.8 million for operational, training, and support facilities at bases of the Air Training Command and $2 million

for personnel and support facilities at the Air University at Maxwell and Gunter Air Force Bases, Ala.

Depot operations.—$7.6 million are included in the program for various operational, maintenance, supply and support facilities at Air Materiel Command depots inside the United States.

Oversea theater forces.—Facilities for forces stationed in oversea theaters include $15.6 million for classified activities of the U.S. security service; $13.8 million for Pacific area bases; and $6.4 million for bases in the European and Middle East area.

Move of Air Force flying activities from the Washington, D.C. area.—$20 million are included in the program for construction at Andrews Air Force Base, Md., to provide a second increment of facilities needed by the Air Force to implement plans for phasing Air Force and Navy flying activities out of Anacostia Naval Air Station, Bolling Air Force Base, and Washington National Airport. Air Force construction authorized in fiscal year 1959 at Andrews provided the long leadtime airfield construction plus support facilities to accommodate the Air Force flying activity to be moved from Washington National Airport. The additional facilities in this fiscal year 1960 request will accommodate the flying activities to be moved from Bolling Air Force Base.

Unforeseen construction.—$17.5 million of authorization is requested in this bill for construction of unforeseen projects, without identification to specific construction items or locations. This authorization will provide the Secretary of the Air Force authority to construct urgently required facilities for which requirements are not now known or firm but which must be initiated prior to the next military construction authorization act.

Changing international conditions and operational concepts, changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, improved production schedules, and new or unforeseen research and development requirements often create new and additional facility requirements on which construction must be initiated promptly and provided in short periods of time in order that the weapons and systems may be effectively utilized at the earliest possible dates or by specified requirement dates.

Unused balances of this type of emergency authority available under Public Law 85–685 will expire as of the date of enactment of this bill. Similarly, any unused balance under the emergency authorization requested in this bill will expire on September 30, 1960.

Categories of construction.—In the preceding summary of the program by weapon system and program objectives, each of the program packages discussed includes facilities that fall under the various standard construction categories. The following table shows the distribution of the authorization request by major construction category:

Category:	*Amount*
Operational and training	$651, 947, 000
Maintenance	59, 166, 000
Research, development, and test	22, 146, 000
Supply	13, 924, 000
Hospital and medical	17, 488, 000
Administrative	3, 802, 000
Housing and community	33, 682, 000
Utilities and ground improvements	46, 270, 000
Real estate	649, 000
Unforeseen construction	17, 500, 000
Total	$866, 574, 000

Over two-thirds of the operational and training category which represents about 75 percent of the total program, is composed of missile and satellite facilities.

Hospital and medical.—The hospital and medical facilities category of $17.5 million consists of four hospitals, five dispensaries, and an outpatient facility. The hospitals, which are the predominant portion of this category, include a new hospital at Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, where none currently exists, and three hospitals to replace facilities at Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex.; George Air Force Base, Calif.; and Clark Air Force Base, Philippine Islands. The committee has held some of these hospitals in abeyance, as indicated earlier in this report, until more realistic cost estimates are forthcoming.

Utilities and ground improvement.—Almost half of the "Utilities" category, which makes up 5.3 percent of the total program, is for the provision of increased electric power capacity at aircraft control and warning sites on the North American continent. The balance of the utilities items include the second increment of a program to provide a waterborne sewage system at Thule Air Base in Greenland and utility system extensions and additions at various bases required to support the new facilities to be constructed in this program.

Real estate.—$700,000 are requested in the program for the acquisition of various types of identified real estate interests. These interests include 924 acres of fee purchase at a cost of $450,000; 526 acres of clearance easements at a cost of $152,000; and 25 acres of right-of-way easements at a cost of $47,000. These interests are required primarily for the installation of runway overruns and approach lights, navaids and communications facilities, and to establish clearances for flight safety in runway approach zones. In addition, certain real estate interests, not yet firmly identified, will be acquired under the authorizations requested in section 302 for the missile programs, and for the SAGE supercombat centers and the NORAD combat operations center.

Increases in prior years' authorizations.—The deficiencies, in prior years' Air Force authorizations which have developed during the past year are substantially less than those for which increased authorizations were requested in previous years. The amount of increases requested in this bill total only $2,343,000 as compared with last year's total of $13.4 million and the previous year's total of almost $115 million.

This gratifying reduction in authorization deficiencies has resulted primarily from better estimates as additional experience is gained from awards on newer types of facilities, initiation of advance planning at earlier dates, and advancement of the dates for application of the automatic authorization rescission provisions

The requested increases, which are identified by authorizing public law and installation in sections 305 and 306 of the bill, involve four separate installation project authorizations contained in two prior

years' authorization acts. Following is a summary of the increases for each public law.

Authorization	Current authorization, amount	Authorization increase requested	Revised authorization, amount
Public Law 85-241 (fiscal year 1958)	$607,460,000	$265,000	$607,725,000
Public Law 85-685 (fiscal year 1959)	952,415,000	2,078,000	954,493,000
Total		2,343,000	

Status of authorizations.—Continued progress is being made by the Air Force to reduce the former high balances of unfinanced authorizations. Based upon the amounts of new authorization and appropriations being requested for fiscal year 1960, the effective unfinanced authorization balance at the end of fiscal year 1960 will be down to $239 million as compared to $491 million at the end of fiscal year 1959, $1,200 million at the end of fiscal year 1958, and almost $1,400 million at the end of fiscal year 1957.

This substantial reduction in the unfinanced authorization balance, which primarily is the result of the committee's action in advancing the effective dates for automatic rescission of unused authorizations, permits a more effective management and control of the construction program and a reduction in accounting and reporting workloads.

It is considered that the amount of currently inactive authorizations are the minimum amount required to provide the flexibility needed for orderly progress in the large Air Force construction program.

The following table summarizes the status of Air Force military construction authorizations.

[In millions of dollars]

Total authorization available, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1959	13,315
Less: Reserve for overseas rental guarantee family housing	−100
Less: Estimated rescissions through July 1, 1958	−1,307
Net authorization available through fiscal year 1959	11,908
Less: Total funds available through fiscal year 1959	−10,474
Less: Estimated automatic rescission by sec. 507, Public Law 85-685	−943
Total residual authorization at end of fiscal year 1959	491
Plus: New authorization proposed for fiscal year 1960	+867
Plus: Increases in prior years' authorized by fiscal year 1960 authorization bill	+2
Residual and proposed authorization available through fiscal year 1960	1,360
Less: Proposed fiscal year 1960 military construction appropriation	−894
Less: Estimated automatic rescission by sec. 303(b) and 406, fiscal year 1960 authorization bill	−227
Effective residual authorization at end of fiscal year 1960	239

ATLANTIC MISSILE RANGE

The Atlantic Missile Range is operated by the Air Force Missile Test Center (AFMTC) under the Air Research and Development Command. The headquarters of AFMTC is at Patrick Air Force Base, and its mission is to develop, maintain, and operate the range and to provide support for the DOD and NASA missile and space programs. The primary purpose of the range is to conduct the

research, development, and testing of long-range missiles and space vehicles. The range is composed of the launch area at Cape Canaveral, headquarters and support facilities at Patrick AFB, port facilities, and instrumentation sites on the mainland of Florida and 11 island locations down to Ascension Island off the west coast of Africa. In addition, the ground sites are supported by aircraft and picket ships.

The current active missile and space vehicle programs include REDSTONE, JUPITER, THOR, POLARIS, ATLAS, TITAN, SNARK, BOMARC, PIONEER, and THOR-ABLE. Scheduled future programs include MINUTEMAN, SATURN, MERCURY, PERSHING, DYNASOAR, and MIDAS. Due to its geographical location, this range enjoys a unique capability for the conduct of research and development tests on the systems listed above. Since the launching facilities are located on the U.S. coast, a 5,000 mile overwater range is available. It is a relatively simple matter to control shipping in the range area during firings so that the possibility of accidents is slight. Also, since the launchings are to the southeast, the effective length of the range is increased due to the rotation of the earth on its axis.

The AFMTC is operated by a joint staff composed of representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and NASA. In addition to being a part of the center staff, the Army, Navy, and NASA representatives act as a point of contact for their respective organizations. Certain of the facilities at Cape Canaveral and at the range stations are operated under contract with the Air Force by Pan American World Airways and the Radio Corp. of America.

The instrumentation required for the Atlantic Missile Range operation consists of extremely complex and precise types of equipment and includes metric cameras, tracking radar, impact predictor, long-range tracking telescopes, metcorological sounding stations, testing systems, and telemetry ground receiving equipment. Precise instrumentation in large quantities is needed for research and development purposes in order to measure accurately the perfomance of the missiles being tested. Such complexity and sophistication is not required for launching of developed missiles, either for a training firing or as a proven booster carrying a payload into orbit. The AFMTC has sited new facilities required for testing the PERSHING, MINUTEMAN, and SATURN systems, and has set aside ample room for boosters up to 1.5 million pounds thrust in one area and has reserved the prime launch area at the tip of the cape for boosters in excess of 2.5 million pounds thrust, when, and if, they are programed.

A relatively low rate of expenditures for construction of facilities was required for testing air-breathing missiles which were developed in previous years, whereas the ballistic missiles presently being tested have required the outlay of considerably larger sums in recent years. The total capital assets of the Atlantic Missile Range facilities as of January 1, 1959, are valued at $467.2 million.

The facilities of the range are a function of the performance of the vehicles under test, i.e., the less sophisticated systems require less complex launching and tracking equipment. As speeds, altitudes, and missions are extended, the instrumentation capabilities must be improved to keep pace and the required new launch facilities must be provided.

Title IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

These follow the pattern established in prior military construction acts, and a description of each is outlined below:

Section 401

This section is general authorizing language which has appeared for several years in military construction bills. It will be noted that the authorities granted may be exercised without regard to certain sections of the Revised Statutes and two sections of title 10, United States Code. The laws which will have no application to the construction authorized by this bill are as follows:

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as found in title 31, United States Code, section 529, provides in part as follows:

> No advance of public money shall be made in any case unless authorized by the appropriation concerned or other law. And in all cases of contracts for the performance of any service, or the delivery of articles of any description for the use of the United States, payments shall not exceed the value of the service rendered, or of the articles delivered previously to such payment.

There are situations in connection with public works projects where it may be necessary to advance money prior to the actual receipt of the service or the property to be obtained. For example, where utilities such as power, gas, or water lines are required to be installed and it is necessary for a private utility company to extend its lines to the military installation, the military department ofttimes must pay for the costs of such extension. These payments are eventually recouped by deductions from the periodic payments made for the service to the utility company. However, in the strict sense, such initial payment for installation costs are advance payments for the service rendered.

Section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as found in title 40, United States Code, sections 259 and 267, provides as follows:

> Sec. 259. No money shall be paid nor contracts made for payment for any site for a public building in excess of the amount specifically appropriated therefor.
>
> Sec. 267. No money shall be expended upon any public building until after sketch plans showing the tentative design and arrangement of such building, together with outline description and detailed estimates of the cost thereof, shall have been made by the Administrator of General Services (except when otherwise authorized by law) and said sketch plans, and estimates shall have been approved by the head of each executive department who will have officials located in such building; but such approval shall not prevent subsequent changes in the design, arrangement, materials, or methods of construction or cost which may be found necessary or advantageous: *Provided*, That no such changes shall be made involving an expense in excess of the limit of cost fixed or extended by Congress, and all appropriations made for the

construction of such building shall be expended within the limit of cost so fixed or extended.

In regard to that part of Revised Statutes 3734 as found in title 40, United States Code, section 259, the committee feels that the key to the analysis of that provision are the words "specifically appropriated therefor." It will be noted that the bill permits a 5-percent (United States) and 10-percent (oversea) variation for projects authorized by the bill in order to provide necessary elasticity. It is entirely possible that this elasticity would be lost were the construction subject to this section of the Revised Statutes.

With respect to the second part of Revised Statutes 3734 found in title 40, United States Code, section 267, regarding the making by the General Services of sketch plans, outline descriptions, and detailed estimates of the cost of any public building, it is not believed that such was intended nor should apply to the varied and multitudinous projects authorized by the military construction authorization acts. Such a requirement would place a great administrative burden on the General Services Administration which could only result in serious delay.

Section 9774(d), title 10, United States Code—

> (d) Except when built by members of the Air Force, no permanent barrack, quarters, building, or other permanent structure may be built unless a detailed estimate of its cost has been submitted to Congress and a specific appropriation has been made therefor. No one may build such a structure without specific authority of Congress if the cost is more than $100,000.

It is pointed out that detailed estimates of cost are not available in many cases until the project has been authorized by Congress and an architect and engineering contract has been let and performed.

It will be noted also that the authority granted by this section may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes. This provision of law provides in pertinent part as follows:

Section 355, Revised Statutes—

> No public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purposes of erecting thereon any armory, arsenal, fort, fortification, navy yard, customhouse, lighthouse, or other public building of any kind whatever, until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title * * *.

It should be clearly understood that the exception from the requirement that title to land be approved by the Attorney General prior to the exercise of the authorities granted in this bill does not mean that the opinion of the Attorney General will not be obtained. It means merely that urgent construction can proceed prior to the rendering of such opinion by him.

Section 402

This is the normal authorization language that customarily appears in each annual Military Construction Act, and corresponds to the equivalent section (No. 502) in last year's bill (Public Law 85–685), except that the dollar amounts are of course different.

Section 403

This provision is identical to language in prior acts with the exception that "Alaska" has been written in because it is now a State. In Alaska it is desired that projects may exceed 10 percent as has been the case previously.

The committee denied a request to further amend this section to include the word "Hawaii."

Section 404

Section 404 provides that whenever the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, would interfere with the authorizations granted for construction in foreign countries, and the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for auditing contracts for this construction, the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section. The provision of law referred to is as follows:

SECTION 2313(b), TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

> (b) Each contract negotiated under this chapter shall provide that the Comptroller General and his representatives are entitled, until the expiration of 3 years after final payment, to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of the contractor, or any of his subcontractors, that directly pertain to, and involve transactions relating to, the contract or subcontract.

Section 405

This section relates to the awarding of contracts on a competitive basis, and to the requirement that the military department shall report to the Congress with respect to contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis. The law referred to is the Armed Services Procurement Act.

This section was amended by the committee to provide, in effect, that except under unusual conditions, contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States under this act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Army Corps of Engineers or the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Section 406

This section corresponds to the equivalent section in last year's act (No. 507), and continues in effect the established policy of repealing long-standing military construction authorizations that have not been used by the military departments. As a result, after July 1, 1960, only those authorizations, with certain specified exceptions, which are contained in public laws enacted subsequent to August 31, 1957, would continue to be available. Under this section, unused authorization that has been in effect 3 years will be automatically rescinded. The reasons for exempting various projects from recision are as follows:

(1 and 2) These provisions exempt from rescission those projects which have been authorized in the general provisions of previous military construction authorization acts, and those projects which have been started prior to July 1, 1960, by obligation of funds for construction or for acquisition of land.

(3) This $100 million authorization must be retained for guaranteeing rentals on rental guarantee housing. This subsection is the same as previously included in Public Law 968, 84th Congress, Public Law 85–241, and Public Law 85–685.

(4) This exempts unused authorization in the amount of $10 million for the development of the line of communications, France, the bulk of which is contemplated to be obligated during fiscal year 1960. Under section 507(5) of Public Law 85–685, the amount exempted for line of communications, France was $30 million.

(5) This exempts unused authorization in the amount of $6,439,000 for the development of communications facilities originally scheduled for South America, but now planned for installation in Puerto Rico.

(6) This exempts the authorization for projects covering construction of facilities at various locations. Due to revisions in plans, or site difficulties, the construction of these facilities has been delayed. Details covering each project are as follows:

(*a*) This covers 114 units of family housing ($2,234,000) at Army Security Agency Site 23.

(*b*) This covers a dependent school ($201,000) and a commissary ($168,000) at Army Security Agency Site 23.

(*c*) This covers that portion of the authorization for development of line of communication, France ($5,617,000), that has been reprogramed from Germany to France, and depot facilities ($1,308,000) at Sandhofen, Weisbaden, and Nahbollenbach, Germany.

(*d*) This covers the construction of the Panama sewage-disposal system ($1,060,000) for Army, Navy, and Air Force installations at five locations in the Canal Zone.

(*e*) This covers the final increment ($6,300,000) for construction at the Alternate Joint Communication Center.

(*f*) This covers land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance ($754,000) at Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.

(*g*) This covers impact range facilities ($700,000) in the Ocala National Forest for Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla., as hereinafter itemized:

Bombing and rocket range	$540, 000
3 steel towers, 100 feet high, with bases	30, 000
Officer and crew quarters, 1,200 square feet	14, 000
16 miles roads and bridges	80, 000
Communication facilities	20, 000
16 miles fencing and warning signs	16, 000
Total	700, 000

(*h*) This exempts from repeal the authorization for family housing at eight locations which was enacted by Public Law 85–685, but which would otherwise be rescinded on July 1, 1959, by repeal of all of the acts cited in section 504 of Public Law 85–685.

(*i*) This covers authorization in the amount of $5 million for a hospital at Camp Jackson, S.C. The committee extended this authorization with the understanding that the unit cost per bed shall not exceed $16,000.

Section 407

This section will extend through fiscal year 1962, and increase from 5,000 units to 7,500 units, the leasing authority for housing at tactical installations now contained in section 515 of Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended by section 509 of Public Law 85–685. This

will permit NIKE and other tactical site housing requirements to be met by utilizing existing private housing to the greatest possible extent, thereby reducing the necessity for construction of military quarters.

Section 408

Section 408 corresponds to section 512 of Public Law 85–685, and would amend section 406 of Public Law 85–241 so as to exempt one additional category of family housing—i. e., rental-guarantee housing, from the present requirement for inclusion in the annual Military Construction Act. The reason advanced by the Department of Defense for this additional exemption is that rental-guarantee housing is, in reality, not military construction. Rental-guarantee projects are constructed with foreign capital and are maintained and operated by foreign owners. Defense interest in them is simply the guarantee of a certain level of rental income for a limited period of time, in order to encourage the foreign investors to construct the housing and to reserve the houses for U.S. personnel. The rental-guarantee program is now planned for use only in areas where it is infeasible to build family housing projects with foreign currencies generated by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. Defense Department contends that because of the many complexities involved in both programs, it is not possible to anticipate where the latter might fail and the former succeed; but a degree of administrative flexibility is necessary in the development of programs in foreign countries. It should be noted that rental-guarantee projects customarily are cleared with the House and Senate Armed Services Committees in advance. However, this is not a statutory requirement.

In order to maintain congressional control over what is contracted for, the committee amended this section to place a 5,000-unit limitation over the next 5 years.

Section 409

This section was added by the committee to enable the Department of Defense to acquire needed land in the Ryukyu Islands by lease for indefinite periods of time and to pay in advance substantial sums against the lease. Previously the Department of Defense has acquired such land by what is known as a "determinable estate." However this method has been discontinued since such methods of acquisition infringed upon Japan's residual sovereignty.

Section 410

This section amends the limitations on net floor areas of military family housing, contained in title 10, United States Code, to provide that not more than 10 percent of the units built for company grade officers may be four-bedroom units and may exceed present floor area limitations (1,250 square feet) by 150 square feet. This is necessary because families which are large enough to require four bedrooms also require additional space in the living, dining, and cooking areas.

Section 411

This section provides that housing authorized to be built in foreign countries with appropriated funds under Public Law 85–685, or this act, may be built under the surplus commodity program with foreign currencies generated by the sale of surplus commodities.

Section 412

This provision was added by the committee to limit the number of units of Capehart housing that may be contracted for during fiscal year 1960.

Section 413

This section would initiate a requirement for an annual authorization for the design, development, and procurement of aircraft and missiles.

Section 414

This section was added by the committee since recently attention has been drawn to the fact that the rectification of the Houston ship channel will require certain areas which lie within the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot. In order that the improvement in operation of the Houston ship channel will not be interfered with, it is felt that this amendment to Public Law 85–685 is necessary.

Section 415

The purpose of this section is to eliminate the practice of purchasing title search and insurance for Capehart housing projects built on property owned by the Government. The provision will require this service to be performed by the Department of Justice as it is on all other Government property; authorize the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the mortgages in all respects and prohibit the use of mortgage funds for the payment of fees for title search and insurance.

Section 416

Section 411 corresponds to section 514 of Public Law 85–685, and prescribes the customary cost limitations on certain common and repetitive categories of construction.

Section 417

Section 412 amends Public Law 85–365 so as to increase from $500,000 to $900,000 the authorization for activities which the Armed Forces are providing in support of the Olympic winter games.

Section 418

This section corresponds to section 515 of Public Law 85–685, and is required to differentiate between the Military Construction Act and the Reserve Forces Facilities Act, which is included under title V of this bill.

Title V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Army Reserve	$20, 916, 000
Army National Guard	8, 316, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves	8, 300, 000
Air Force Reserve	4, 093, 000
Air National Guard	15, 580, 000
Total new authorization	57, 205, 000
Deficiency authorizations (prior years):	
Army Reserve	90, 000
Air National Guard	470, 000
Total authorization	57, 765, 000

Title V of the proposed legislation would provide specific line-item project authorization for fiscal year 1960 for each of the Reserve com-

ponents: Army Reserve, Army National Guard, Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, Air Force Reserve, and Air National Guard. In addition, the proposed legislation provides for the correction of deficiencies in cost estimates for several items authorized by the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958 (title VI of Public Law 85–685) and for the rescission of certain authorizations granted in that same act for locations which since have been deleted from the programs of the respective Reserve components. The authorizations contained in the proposed legislation, and, in fact, the administration of the whole broad facilities program for all of the Reserve components, are subject to the provisions of chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, as amended, which constitute the codified version of the permanent provisions of the original National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (Public Law 783, 81st Congress) which initiated this comprehensive federally supported facilities program for all of the Reserve components and placed responsibility for its direction and control in the Secretary of Defense. The committee believes that the program is being capably administered and that the requested authorizations contained in the proposed legislation represent well justified and carefully screened requirements for the respective components.

The total amount of new project authorization as originally recommended by the Department of Defense including adjustments requested at the time of the Senate hearing for Reserve Forces construction is $57,037,000; correction of deficiencies in the estimated costs of several of the projects authorized in the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958 results in a total increase of $560,000, which is more than offset by the rescission of items totaling $2,022,000, for a net decrease of $1,462,000 in last year's new project authorization.

The following summary shows in a concise manner the status of authorizations which will exist upon enactment of the proposed legislation (all figures are in millions of dollars):

	Army		Naval and Marine Corps Reserves	Air Force		Total
	Reserve	National Guard		Reserve	Air National Guard	
Carryover authorization into fiscal year 1959	28.0	16.5	11.5	4.0	0	60.0
Authorization in Public Law 85–685	5.0	23.3	11.9	5.1	12.0	57.3
Less appropriations through fiscal year 1959	−29.0	−21.8	−20.4	−8.5	−9.6	−89.3
Residual authorization to be available at end fiscal year 1959	4.0	18.0	3.0	.6	2.4	28.0
New authorization proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	20.7	8.3	8.3	4.1	15.6	57.0
Increases in prior year authorized proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	.1	0	0	0	.5	.6
Rescission of prior year authorized proposed by fiscal year 1960 bill	0	−.7	−1.3	0	0	−2.0
Less proposed fiscal year 1960 appropriation	−20.0	−11.0	−9.0	−4.0	−17.0	−61.0
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1960	4.8	14.6	1.0	.7	1.5	22.6

This tabulation indicates that the amount of residual authorization is being held will within reasonable limits, except in the case of the Army National Guard, the reason for which is indicated later in this report.

Army Reserve Forces.—The committee has been advised that the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve are currently undergoing a major reorganization to aline their troop structures with the pentomic concept of the Active Army. Extensive studies are being conducted by the Department of Defense, concurrently as the reorganization plans progress, to reassess the overall facilities requirements of these two Reserve components.

The Army Reserve new project authorization proposed for fiscal year 1960 totals $20,916,000, and includes 63 new Army Reserve centers and approximately 75 projects which are additions or expansions to present centers.

The proposed new project authorization for fiscal year 1960 for the Army National Guard totals $8,316,000, and provides for 47 new armories, 13 projects for conversion of existing armories, and 5 nonarmory projects which consist of maintenance and supply administrative facilities.

A large part of the new authorization requested for both the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve are projects that were approved by consultation-type authorization prior to converting the bulk authorization of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to a line-item type of program. The Reserve Facilities Act of 1958 which accomplished this conversion to line item authorization provided that those consultation projects listed in the data submitted to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate in June 1958 would remain authorized through fiscal year 1960 to the extent of funds theretofore appropriated. At the time the data was furnished the committees it was pointed out that for reasons of needed flexibility in the Army programs the projects listed totaled more than the appropriations available, and that projects from this so-called carryover authorization could only be constructed within the available appropriations, as subsequently provided in section 604 of Public Law 85–685. The carryover of consultation-type authorization and, specifically, the limitation as to its use is pointed out to clarify cases of new authorizations in the present bill which might appear to be a duplication of authorization if this facet of the Reserve Facilities Act of 1958 is not recalled. The unfundable residual items from the carryover list generally were of a higher priority than the line item authorizations written into Public Law 85–685. Therefore they are being proposed for authorization as line items in this year's bill. The reauthorization of this type of unfunded carryover authorization accounts for the substantial amount of residual authorization shown for the Army National Guard in the above tabulation.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserves.—Nearly half of the $8.3 million of new project authorization proposed for these Reserve components is for essential additional facilities at established Naval Air Reserve installations. The remainder is divided almost evenly between the Naval Surface Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve.

Air Force Reserve components.—The relatively small amount of new project authorization proposed for the Air Force Reserve $4,093,000, reflects the substantial fulfillment of the most urgent requirements for this component, and consists of a variety of operational and support facilities at eight locations, four of which are municipal airports and the remainder jointly utilized military airfields.

For the Air National Guard, the proposed new project authorization totals $15,580,000 comprising high-priority requirements for the operation and support of the Air National Guard aircraft at various locations, 1 of which is in Puerto Rico and another in the Hawaiian Islands; and 3 aircraft control and warning facilities, 2 of which also are in the Hawaiian Islands.

RÉSUMÉ OF THE PROGRAM TO DATE

Army Reserve and Army National Guard.—Since 1951, the Army has had appropriated to it $251 million, of which $144.5 million represents contributions made, or to be made, to the States for the National Guard armory and nonarmory programs and $106.4 million represents facilities for the Army Reserve.

In the National Guard armory program 916 of the 1,890 armories constructed by the States without Federal assistance represent adequate facilities for continued use, against a total requirement of 2,250 armories as estimated by the Department of the Army; the States and the National Guard Bureau, however, estimate total requirements as 2,780 armories. These estimates remain to be reconciled upon completion of the new troop unit program under the pentomic division organizational structure, and the revised plan of distribution of these units throughout the States. A total of 1,211 armories have been constructed, are under construction, or are funded within $130 million of the total appropriations heretofore made available for the National Guard. Thus the remaining requirement for National Guard armories will range between 123 and 653 upon completion of the revised troop unit program by the Department of the Army. Approximately $22 million of the total appropriations heretofore made available for the National Guard represent nonarmory facilities (maintenance shops, supply and administrative facilities) which have been constructed, are under construction, or are programed for early initiation.

In the Army Reserve center program 458 of the 1,617 facilities acquired by lease or donation, and now in use, represent facilities adequate for continued use, against an estimated total requirement of 1,800 centers. A total of 445 centers have been constructed, are under construction, or are funded within the $106.4 million appropriations heretofore made available for Army Reserve construction. Thus the remaining requirement for Army Reserve centers is estimated at 897 centers, representing a future authorization and funding requirement of $234 million. The requirement, also, may be subject to revision upon completion of the new troop unit program under the pentomic division organizational structure, and the revised plan of distribution of these Army Reserve units throughout the States.

Navy (aviation, surface, Marine Corps).—Most of the 500-plus facilities now used for the training of Naval and Marine Corps reservists were acquired from surplus World War II activities and are of temporary construction. Others are held on lease from non-Federal sources. In either case, ultimate replacement or modification will be required.

The Naval Reserve Forces program is composed of three segments:

(*a*) The Naval Reserve, aviation program (which supports Marine Corps Reserve aviation) in fiscal year 1960 will occupy 18 installations.

The modern aircraft which are operated by Naval and Marine Reserve squadrons require modernization or replacement of out-dated support facilities. Thus, a continuing requirement will exist for these activities to be developed and maintained so as to permit realization of the full potential of the reserve units supported.

(*b*) The Naval Reserve, surface program consists of 319 training centers and facilities, and 160 electronics facilities and stations. Modernization or replacement of a great majority of these will ultimately be required, since they consist primarily of temporary wooden, quonset, or Butler-hut construction. In addition, berthing facilities and dockside services for Selected Reserve ships are needed in some locations.

(*c*) The Marine Corps Reserve, ground program consists of 228 training centers, 159 of which are combined with the Naval Reserve training centers mentioned above. Replacement or modernization of most of these will ultimately be required to provide for training of the drilling units in the use and maintenance of their assigned equipment.

Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard.—The Air Force Reserve currently is composed of 15 medium troop carrier wings, with 45 tactical squadrons, and 5 air rescue squadrons. The Air National Guard is composed of 24 wings with 82 combat squadrons of fighter and tactical types. These 39 wings represent the mobilization requirement of the Air Reserve Forces.

In addition to the preceeding tactical units of the Air Reserve Forces, the mobilization requirements include 158 support type units. These units are composed of specialists in the fields of weather, communications, air resupply, air evacuation, terminal operations, and hospital operation.

The Air Force Reserve has funded $77.2 million under the authorization provided through fiscal year 1959. The expenditure of these funds has permitted the Air Force Reserve to render all their flying bases operational, in varying degrees, and has contributed immeasurably to the high degree of combat capability which the Reserve troop carrier units now enjoy. Approximately $26 million after fiscal year 1960 will be required to completely round out the 36 Reserve troop carrier flying bases.

The Air National Guard will have obligated some $224.3 million through fiscal year 1960. A requirement of $52.2 million will yet be required to complete required facilities on the 94 flying bases, and 41 nonflying locations. No new bases are required, although replacement will be needed for some of the World War II temporary construction. In addition, some expansion of facilities will be required to accommodate the higher performance aircraft being received by the tactical units.

COMMITTEE CONCLUSIONS

The committee considers that the Department of Defense should place additional emphasis on the construction of National Guard armories.

The Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1950 authorized Federal grants of as much as 75 percent toward the construction of these armories. Such grants were in recognition that to meet mobilization requirements, the National Guard should be maintained at a strength in excess of purely State needs.

The Department of Defense not only has requested much less construction authorization for armories than the States were prepared to make their contributions toward, but, in addition, expenditure limitations have been imposed on appropriations available for this purpose.

The committee was informed that Federal contributions to this program were suspended from July 1, 1957, until February 1958. At that time, the limit of Federal support was set at $14 million, an amount half that authorized in the 2 preceding fiscal years. The committee also was informed that State legislatures have appropriated more than $30 million for contributions to this program when the necessary Federal funds are made available.

The committee urges the Department to give a higher priority to the construction of the facilities required by the existing troop strength of the National Guard.

Title VI

The Army obtained approximately 4.5 acres of land by transfer from the U.S. Coast Guard, Santa Cruz, Calif., in January 1959. This site, known as Lighthouse Point site, was selected as a site for an approved Army Reserve center. Plans and designs were underway to construct the one-unit (modified), 100-man Army Reserve center at this location at an estimated cost of $164,000. The Army planned to advertise the project in April or May of 1959 as part of the fiscal year 1959 execution program. However, the city officials of Santa Cruz requested the Army not to build on the site as the city had other plans for the use of not only that site but the surrounding area.

Alternate sites were offered by the city for the location of the Army Reserve center. Army representatives inspected alternate sites in Santa Cruz in late January 1959 and determined that an alternate site, known as the airport site, containing approximately 4 acres, appeared to be adequate for the location of the center. The city of Santa Cruz offered to exchange the city-owned airport site for the Government-owned Lighthouse Point site and offered to pay the difference in fair market value. The city also offered to extend water and sewerage facilities to the airport site at no expense to the Government and make available to the Army any fill materials necessary for the preparation of the airport site.

Since there was no statutory authority to exchange the lands between the Army and the city of Santa Cruz, the requisite authority has been inserted as title VI in the bill.

The committee wishes to point out that the interests of the United States are well protected in this exchange of lands in that the city of Santa Cruz must pay to the United States the sum of money which represents, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property to be conveyed by the United States exceeds the fair market value of the land to be received by the United States; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the Reserve center at Lighthouse Point; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer, and water facilities, and site preparation for the Reserve center at the new site exceeds the estimated cost for these facilities.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment into law of this proposed legislation will involve the expenditure of $1,232,611,000. Of this amount, $57,765,000 represents Reserve components construction.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

This measure is part of the legislative program of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1960 and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in its original form as is evidenced by letter dated February 10, 1959, from Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy which is set out below and made a part of this report.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 10, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. NIXON: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1959, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to its presentation to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation would authorize additional military construction that is urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in prior construction authorizations. The appropriation of money required for construction is provided for in the budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1960.

This legislation consists of title I, II, and III covering authorization required for the Active Forces of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; title IV covering general provisions relating to the foregoing titles; and title V covering authorization required for the respective Reserve components.

For the Active Forces, this proposal would authorize new construction totaling $1,299,297,000 of which $231,252,000 is for the Department of the Army; $195,284,000 is for the Department of the Navy, and $872,761,000 is for the Department of the Air Force. This proposal would also provide additional monetary authority to correct deficiencies in authorization for projects authorized under previous laws totaling $4,379,000 of which $1,186,000 is for the Army; $850,000 is for the Navy; and $2,343,000 is for the Air Force. Therefore, the total in this proposed legislation of new authorization plus additional monetary authority for projects previously authorized amounts to $1,303,676,000 for the Active Forces.

This proposal would also repeal as of July 1, 1960, all authorizations, with certain exceptions, for military construction for the Active Forces that are contained in laws enacted prior to August 31, 1957. This repeal will continue in effect the policy established in the fiscal year 1956 Military Construction Authorization Act (Public Law 161, 84th Cong.) of repealing longstanding authority that has not been exercised by the military departments. It is believed that the continuation of this policy will result in a construction program which will reflect more accurately the current needs of the Department of Defense.

For the Reserve components, the proposal would authorize construction totaling $56,993,000 of which $20,748,000 is for the Army Reserve; $8,316,000 is for the Army National Guard; $8,300,000 is for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; $4,093,000 is for the Air Force Reserve; and $15,536,000 is for the Air National Guard. It would also provide additional monetary authority to correct deficiencies in authorization for certain projects contained in Public Law 85–685 totaling $560,000 of which $470,000 is for the Air National Guard and $90,000 is for the Army Reserve. Therefore, the total of new authorization plus additional monetary authority for projects previously authorized amounts to $57,553,000 for the Reserve components. This proposed legislation also provides for the rescission of authorization contained in Public Law 85–685 for certain installations which are no longer required.

Accordingly, the total authorization requested in this legislation for both the Active Forces and the Reserve components amounts to $1,361,229,000.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL MCELROY.

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

INSIDE UNITED STATES

Alabama	$9,859,000
Army:	
Redstone Arsenal	4,543,000
Fort Rucker	2,636,000
Air Force:	
Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery	1,915,000
Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery	391,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Gadsden	144,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Birmingham	160,000
National Guard Armory, New Brockton	70,000
Alaska	23,997,000
Army:	
Fort Greely	2,395,000
Fort Richardson	321,000
Navy:	
Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake	84,000
Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak	40,000
Air Force:	
Eielson Air Force Base	1,181,000
Elmendorf Air Force Base	1,150,000
Galena Airport	100,000
King Salmon Airport	1,690,000
Ladd Air Force Base	250,000
Various locations	16,510,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Anchorage	276,000
Arizona	8,345,000
Army: Fort Huachuca	3,230,000
Navy: Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma	3,851,000
Air Force:	
Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson	895,000
Williams Air Force Base, Chandler	246,000
Air National Guard: Tucson MAP, Tucson	123,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

Arkansas	$4,338,000
Air Force:	
Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville	1,099,000
Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock	325,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, El Dorado	152,000
Army Reserve Center, Fort Smith	152,000
Army Reserve Center, Harrison	152,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Beebe	45,000
National Guard Armory, DeWitt	45,000
National Guard Armory, Hazen	45,000
Air National Guard: Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock	2,323,000
California	75,046,000
Army: Presidio of San Francisco	218,000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow	432,000
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro	48,000
Naval Air Station, Lemoore	24,554,000
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach	500,000
Naval Air Station, Miramar	305,000
Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu	30,000,000
Naval Supply Depot, San Diego	100,000
Naval Training Center, San Diego	144,000
Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana	2,216,000
Naval Station, Treasure Island	701,000
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms	457,000
Air Force:	
Beale Air Force Base, Marysville	187,000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced	425,000
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc	787,000
Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael	1,285,000
March Air Force Base, Riverside	6,052,000
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento	1,980,000
McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento	1,548,000
Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard	255,000
Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc	147,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Chico	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Sacramento	61,000
Army Reserve Center, San Diego	526,000
Army Reserve Center, San Jose	1
Army Reserve Center, Santa Barbara	136,000
Army Reserve Center, Vallejo	302,000
Naval Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos	563,000
Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego	226,000
Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael	490,000
Air National Guard: Ontario Map, Ontario	233,000
Colorado	11,316,000
Army: Fitzsimons Army Hospital	188,000
Air Force: Lowry Air Force Base, Denver	405,000
Colorado Springs area	10,000,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Greeley	132,000
Air National Guard: Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver	591,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

Connecticut	$3,731,000
Navy:	
Naval Submarine Base, New London	3,146,000
Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London	75,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Bridgeport-Fairchild	64,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven	323,000
Air National Guard: Bradley Field, Hartford	123,000
Delaware: Air Force: Dover Air Force Base, Dover	750,000
District of Columbia: Navy: Naval Research Laboratory	1,591,000
Florida	27,155,000
Navy:	
Navy Communication Training Center, Corry Field	1,000,000
Naval Air Station, Pensacola	400,000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field	2,811,000
Air Force:	
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso	833,000
Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead	6,364,000
MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa	866,000
Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa	1,822,000
McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando	8,402,000
Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City	4,266,000
Naval Reserve: Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa	391,000
Georgia	5,523,000
Army:	
Fort Benning	1,090,000
Fort Stewart	238,000
Air Force:	
Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah	410,000
Robins Air Force Base, Macon	900,000
Turner Air Force Base, Albany	1,098,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Savannah	259,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Gainesville	90,000
National Guard Armory, Savannah	600,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base, Atlanta)	838,000
Idaho	1,704,000
Air Force: Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home	1,361,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Idaho Falls	105,000
Air National Guard: Gowen Field, Boise	238,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

Illinois	$11,366,000
Army: Savanna Ordnance Depot	1,160,000
Navy: Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	4,712,000
Air Force: Scott Air Force Base, Belleville	253,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Aurora	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Bloomington	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Champaign	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Chicago Heights	302,000
Army Reserve Center, East St. Louis	156,000
Army Reserve Center, Evanston	574,000
Army Reserve Center, Joliet	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Kankakee	168,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves:	
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign	70,000
Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago	518,000
Naval Air Station, Glenview	59,000
Air Force Reserve: O'Hare International Airport, Chicago	1,890,000
Air National Guard: Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria	430,000
Indiana	3,339,000
Air Force: Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru	1,725,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Anderson	136,000
Army Reserve Center, Bloomington	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Hammond	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Muncie	168,000
Air Force Reserve: Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus	364,000
Air National Guard:	
Baer Field, Fort Wayne	238,000
Hulman Field, Terre Haute	238,000
Iowa: Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Washington	160,000
Kansas	6,380,000
Army: Fort Leavenworth	160,000
Air Force:	
Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka	762,000
McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita	1,039,000
Schilling Air Force Base, Salina	4,147,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Colby	80,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, Olathe	192,000
Kentucky	5,001,000
Army:	
Fort Knox	2,541,000
Fort Campbell	2,300,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Bardstown	160,000
Louisiana	4,052,000
Air Force:	
Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport	110,000
Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles	350,000
England Air Force Base, Alexandria	2,468,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Lafayette	152,000
Army Reserve Center, New Orleans (No. 1)	520,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, New Orleans	178,000
Air National Guard: Naval Air Station, New Orleans	274,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

Maine	$4, 692, 000
Navy:	
Naval Radio Station, Washington County	3, 179, 000
Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor	271, 000
Air Force:	
Dow Air Force Base, Bangor	1, 071, 000
Loring Air Force Base, Limestone	48, 000
Air National Guard: Dow Air Force Base, Bangor	123, 000
Maryland	28, 664, 000
Army:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground	785, 000
Fort Detriek	270, 000
Fort Meade	2, 530, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Faeility, Towers Field, Camp Springs	1, 051, 000
Naval Academy, Annapolis	1, 025, 000
David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock	318, 000
Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head	972, 000
Naval Air Station, Patuxent River	1, 050, 000
Air Force: Andrews Air Foree Base, Camp Springs	20, 000, 000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Cumberland	288, 000
Army Reserve Center, Westminster	160, 000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Baltimore	215, 000
Massaehusetts	4, 443, 000
Army: Fort Devens	59, 000
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Boston	1, 422, 000
Air Foree:	
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford	1, 452, 000
Otis Air Foree Base, Falmouth	1, 234, 000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Leominster	200, 000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, South Weymouth	76, 000
Miehigan	10, 578, 000
Air Foree:	
Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Ste. Marie	1, 755, 000
K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette	2, 779, 000
Selfridge Air Foree Base, Mount Clemens	612, 000
Wurtsmith Air Foree Base, Oseoda	2, 484, 000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Ann Arbor	317, 000
Army Reserve Center (No. 1)	602, 000
Army Reserve Center, Detroit (No. 2)	602, 000
Army Reserve Center, Flint	551, 000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile	771, 000
Air National Guard: Alpena County Airport, Alpena	105, 000
Minnesota	2, 154, 000
Air Force: Duluth Munieipal Airport, Duluth	766, 000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Duluth	317, 000
Army Reserve Center, Mankato	176, 000
Army Reserve Center, St. Cloud	330, 000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, St. Paul	565, 000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

Mississippi	$5, 627, 000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian	5, 147, 000
Air Force: Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus	264, 000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Durant	54, 000
National Guard Armory, Iuka	54, 000
National Guard Armory, Quitman	54, 000
National Guard Armory, Webb	54, 000
Missouri	6, 214, 000
Army:	
Fort Leonard Wood	553, 000
Army Support Center, St. Louis	261, 000
Air Force:	
Richards-Gerbaur Air Force Base, Kansas City	866, 000
Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster	2, 406, 000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Fulton	160, 000
Army Reserve Center, Jefferson City	288, 000
Army Reserve Center, Rolla	160, 000
Army Reserve Center, Springfield	73, 000
Army Reserve Center, Washington	160, 000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Farmington	115, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves:	
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center (ground), St. Louis	370, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center (surface), St. Louis	697, 000
Air Force Reserve: Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City	105, 000
Montana	5, 171, 000
Air Force:	
Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow	3, 661, 000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls	712, 000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Butte	70, 000
National Guard Armory, Plentywood	63, 000
Air National Guard: Gore Field, Great Falls	665, 000
Nebraska	2, 416, 000
Air Force:	
Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln	164, 000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha	1, 802, 000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Omaha	450, 000
Nevada	816, 000
Air Force: Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas	557, 000
Air National Guard: Hubbard Field, Reno	259, 000
New Hampshire	4, 039, 000
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth	3, 497, 000
Air Force: Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth	542, 000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

New Jersey	$3, 112, 000
Army: Fort Dix	64, 000
Navy:	
Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne	123, 000
Naval Air Station, Lakehurst	726, 000
Air Force: McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown	1, 083, 000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Morristown	317, 000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Cape May Court House	250, 000
National Guard Armory, Dover	250, 000
Organizational maintenance shop, Jersey City	49, 000
National Guard Armory, Riverdale	250, 000
New Mexico	3, 584, 000
Air Force:	
Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis	800, 000
Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo	909, 000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell	942, 000
Sacramento Peak, Alamogordo	616, 000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Belen	57, 000
National Guard Armory, Roswell	200, 000
National Guard Armory, Silver City	60, 000
New York	10, 945, 000
Army: U.S. Military Academy	6, 303, 000
Navy:	
Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn	365, 000
Naval Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn	113, 000
Air Force:	
Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome	676, 000
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh	1, 134, 000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton	269, 000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Bronx	98, 000
Army Reserve Center, Glens Falls	176, 000
Army Reserve Center, Malone	176, 000
Army Reserve Center, Olean	176, 000
Army Reserve Center, Oswego	176, 000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Amsterdam	55, 000
National Guard Armory, Buffalo	75, 000
Combined Field Maintenance Shop, Camp Drum	308, 000
National Guard Armory, Olean	46, 000
National Guard Armory, Oswego	52, 000
National Guard Armory, Troy	47, 000
Naval Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone	104, 000
Air National Guard: Hancock Field, Syracuse	596, 000
North Carolina	4, 751, 000
Army: Fort Bragg	958, 000
Navy: Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune	328, 000
Air Force: Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro	3, 150, 000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Benson	105, 000
National Guard Armory, Elizabeth City	105, 000
National Guard Armory, Mount Olive	105, 000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

North Dakota	$6,683,000
Air Force:	
Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks	2,309,000
Minot Air Force Base, Minot	3,371,000
Army National Guard: Shop hangar, Bismarck	57,000
Air National Guard: Hector Field, Fargo	946,000
Ohio	19,908,000
Army: Columbus General Depot	2,783,000
Air Force:	
Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington	2,475,000
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton	12,000,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Akron (No. 2)	574,000
Army Reserve Center, Bellaire	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Dayton	48,000
Army Reserve Center, Delaware	302,000
Army Reserve Center, Marion	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Mount Vernon	168,000
Army Reserve Center, Painesville	168,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Lancaster	160,000
Naval Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland	655,000
Air National Guard: Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield	105,000
Oklahoma	8,261,000
Army: Fort Sill	5,337,000
Air Force:	
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton	621,000
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City	1,036,000
Vance Air Force Base, Enid	250,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Muskogee	288,000
Army Reserve Center, Okmulgee	160,000
Army Reserve Center, Purcell	160,000
Air Force Reserve: Davis Field, Muskogee	92,000
Air National Guard: Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City	317,000
Oregon	1,764,000
Air Force: Kingsley Air Force Base, Klamath	955,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Salem	61,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Salem	160,000
Air Force Reserve: Portland International Airport, Portland	588,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

Pennsylvania	$6, 527, 000
Army: Letterkenny Ordnance Depot	454, 000
Navy: Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia	333, 000
Air Force: Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown	2, 676, 000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Allentown-Bethlehem	302, 000
Army Reserve Center, Butler	136, 000
Army Reserve Center, Gettysburg	168, 000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Meadville	168, 000
Army Reserve Center, Pittsburgh (No. 3)	574, 000
Army Reserve Center, Uniontown	220, 000
Army Reserve Center, Washington	136, 000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Johnstown	375, 000
Naval Reserve: Naval Air Station, Willow Grove	797, 000
Air Force Reserve: Willow Naval Grove Air Station, Philadelphia	188, 000
Rhode Island: Navy: Naval Station, Newport	7, 353, 000
South Carolina	1, 576, 000
Navy: Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort	51, 000
Air Force:	
Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston	822, 000
Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter	505, 000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Inman	99, 000
National Guard Armory, Jonesville	99, 000
South Dakota	1, 736, 000
Air Force: Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City	1, 445, 000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Aberdeen	168, 000
Air National Guard: Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls	123, 000
Tennessee	10, 185, 000
Air Force:	
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma	5, 690, 000
Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna	2, 249, 000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Milan	91, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves: Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City	330, 000
Air National Guard: Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis	1, 825, 000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

Texas	$21,052,000
Army:	
Fort Bliss	7,260,000
Fort Sam Houston	620,000
Air Force:	
Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo	1,828,000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin	300,000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso	416,000
Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth	1,484,000
Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene	292,000
James Connally Air Force Base, Waco	216,000
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio	1,180,000
Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio	1,307,000
Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman	408,000
Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls	807,000
Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring	2,168,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Brownsville	152,000
Army Reserve Center, Dallas	64,000
Army Reserve Center, Galveston	152,000
Army Reserve Center, Odessa	152,000
Army Reserve Center, San Marcos	152,000
Army Reserve Center, San Antonio	520,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Donna	99,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves:	
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont	65,000
Naval Air Station, Dallas	348,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves:	
Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston	204,000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville	35,000
Air Force Reserve: Ellington Air Force Base, Houston	823,000
Utah	873,000
Army: Dugway Proving Ground	532,000
Air Force: Hill Air Force Base, Ogden	341,000
Vermont	435,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Rutland	143,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Enosburg Falls	169,000
Air National Guard: Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington	123,000
Virginia	4,009,000
Army:	
Fort Belvoir	628,000
Fort Lee	414,000
A. P. Hill Military Reservation	229,000
Navy:	
Naval Communication Station, Norfolk	1,781,000
Naval Station, Norfolk	81,000
Naval Air Station, Oceana	336,000
Air Force: Langley Air Force Base, Hampton	540,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

Washington	$2,470,000
Air Force:	
Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane	158,000
Geiger Air Force Base, Spokane	190,000
Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake	1,036,000
McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma	523,000
Army Reserve: Army Reserve Center, Wenatchee	168,000
Army National Guard: National Guard Armory, Coleville	150,000
Air National Guard: Geiger Field, Spokane	245,000
West Virginia	4,277,000
Navy: Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove	3,957,000
Army National Guard:	
U.S. property and fiscal officer, office and warehouse, Buckhannon	206,000
National Guard Armory, Princeton	60,000
National Guard Armory, Ronceverte	54,000
Wisconsin	23,323,000
Air Force: Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville	21,533,000
Army Reserve:	
Army Reserve Center, Beaver Dam	176,000
Army Reserve Center, La Crosse	317,000
Army Reserve Center, Milwaukee (West)	602,000
Army National Guard:	
Organizational maintenance shop, Hayward	52,000
National Guard Armory, Milwaukee	235,000
National Guard Armory, Tomahawk	160,000
Air Force Reserve: General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee	43,000
Air National Guard:	
Camp Williams, Camp Douglas	82,000
Truax Field, Madison	123,000
Wyoming	1,699,000
Air Force: Francis E. Warren, Cheyenne	1,461,000
Air National Guard: Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne	238,000
Various locations (Zone of Interior)	95,163,000
Army: Various	14,840,000
Air Force: Various	77,651,000
Army Reserve: Various	2,588,000
Army National Guard: Various	84,000
Classified (Zone of Interior)	436,305,000
Navy: Various	1,625,000
Air Force: Various	434,680,000
OUTSIDE UNITED STATES	
Bermuda	295,000
Navy: Naval Station, Bermuda	295,000
Canada	4,133,000
Navy: Naval Station, Argentia	4,133,000

SUMMARY OF THE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY GRANTED BY CONGRESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1960 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL—Continued

Canal Zone	$228,000
Army: Fort Kobbe	228,000
Cuba	760,000
Navy: Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay	760,000
France	140,000
Army: Various locations	140,000
Germany	10,338,000
Army: Various locations	10,338,000
Hawaii	10,417,000
Army:	
Helemano	90,000
Schofield Barracks	1,259,000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu	47,000
Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu	4,796,000
Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu	274,000
Air National Guard:	
Haleakala aircraft control and warning facility, Maui	446,000
Hickam Field, Honolulu	3,222,000
Kokee aircraft control and warning facility, Kauai	283,000
Italy	1,973,000
Army: Various locations	1,973,000
Japan	1,640,000
Navy: Naval Air Station, Atsugi	1,640,000
Mariana Islands	11,560,000
Navy:	
Public Works Center, Guam	10,947,000
Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam	507,000
Air Force: Anderson Air Force Base	106,000
North Ireland	267,000
Navy: Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry	267,000
Okinawa	2,255,000
Army: Camp Buckner	217,000
Navy: Naval Security Group activity, Okinawa	2,038,000
Philippine Islands	76,000
Navy: Naval Air Station, Cubi Point	76,000

Summary of the Construction Authority Granted by Congress in the Fiscal Year 1960 Military Construction Authorization Bill—Continued

Puerto Rico	$6,367,000
Navy:	
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads	3,579,000
Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca	86,000
Air Force: Ramey Air Force Base	1,309,000
Army National Guard:	
National Guard Armory, Bayamon	150,000
National Guard Armory, Ponce	150,000
National Guard Armory, San German	150,000
Air National Guard: San Juan International Airport, San Juan	943,000
Turkey	105,000
Navy: Naval Security Group activity, Karamursel	105,000
Wake Island	2,211,000
Air Force: Wake Island	2,211,000
Various locations (overseas)	78,098,000
Army: Various	9,965,000
Air Force: Various	68,133,000
Classified locations (overseas)	107,561,000
Army: Various	81,830,000
Navy: Various	16,870,000
Air Force: Various	8,861,000
Locations not specified	35,000,000
Army: Various	10,000,000
Navy: Various	10,000,000
Air Force: Various	15,000,000

*Note.—See note on page 1.

○

Calendar No. 284

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5674

[Report No. 296]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 17 (legislative day, APRIL 15), 1959
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MAY 19, 1959
Reported by Mr. STENNIS, with an amendment

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

~~TITLE I~~

~~SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:~~

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,387,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $3,230,000.

~~(Corps of Engineers)~~

~~Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.~~

~~(Transportation Corps)~~

~~Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,866,000.~~

~~Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina: Family housing, $251,000.~~

~~(Medical Corps)~~

~~Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.~~

~~FIELD FORCES FACILITIES~~

~~(First Army Area)~~

~~Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.~~

~~Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.~~

~~(Second Army Area)~~

~~A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.~~

~~Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,747,000.~~

~~Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.~~

~~(Third Army Area)~~

~~Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.~~

~~Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facility, $1,228,000.~~

~~Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.~~

~~Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $2,662,000.~~

~~Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.~~

~~(Fourth Army Area)~~

~~Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,260,000.~~

~~Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.~~

~~Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.~~

~~(Fifth Army Area)~~

~~Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.~~

~~Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $593,000.~~

~~Army Support Center, St. Louis Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.~~

~~(Sixth Army Area)~~

~~Fort Ord, California: Supply facilities, $85,000.~~

~~Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.~~

~~(United States Military Academy)~~

~~United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000.~~

~~(Alaska Command Area)~~

~~Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.~~

~~Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.~~

~~(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)~~

~~Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.~~

~~Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $29,026,000:~~

~~Outside the United States~~

~~(Pacific Command Area)~~

~~Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.~~

~~Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259,000.~~

~~Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.~~

~~Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.~~

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, apurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $83,330,000.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may estab-

lish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Commit-

tees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.

Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.

Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.

Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.

Fort Ord, California, 500 units.

Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES

FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,197,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities, $701,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Flor-

ida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administratve facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,897,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,940,000.

~~(Special Purpose Air Stations)~~

~~Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.~~

~~Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.~~

~~Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,196,000.~~

~~Naval Air Materiel Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.~~

~~Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,050,000.~~

~~SUPPLY FACILITIES~~

~~Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.~~

~~Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.~~

~~Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.~~

~~MARINE CORPS FACILITIES~~

~~Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.~~

~~Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.~~

~~Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.~~

~~ORDNANCE FACILITIES~~

~~Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.~~

~~SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES~~

~~Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.~~

~~Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.~~

~~Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.~~

~~Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real Estate, $81,000.~~

~~Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.~~

MEDICAL FACILITIES

~~Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.~~

~~COMMUNICATION FACILITIES~~

~~Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.~~

~~Naval Security Groups Activity, Camp Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.~~

~~Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.~~

~~Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.~~

~~Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.~~

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana, Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $1,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $11,934,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $781,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquir-

ing, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $21,765,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as

of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as

amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 450 units.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000". (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by strik-

ing out "$373,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000" and "$337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

~~K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.~~

~~Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.~~

~~Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.~~

~~McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.~~

~~Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.~~

~~Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,078,000.~~

~~Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $255,000.~~

~~Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.~~

~~Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.~~

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

~~Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,303,000.~~

~~McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.~~

~~Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $2,676,000.~~

~~Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.~~

~~Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.~~

~~Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,458,000.~~

~~AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND~~

~~Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.~~

~~Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $542,000.~~

~~Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.~~

~~Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:~~

Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $2,258,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,598,000.

~~Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.~~

~~Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,741,000.~~

~~Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.~~

~~Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,193,000.~~

~~AIR UNIVERSITY~~

~~Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.~~

~~Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.~~

~~HEADQUARTERS COMMAND~~

~~Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $21,357,000.~~

~~MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE~~

~~Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.~~

~~Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.~~

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, $569,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Mainte-

nance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,075,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,260,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

~~Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.~~

~~Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $1,461,000.~~

~~Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,711,000.~~

~~Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.~~

~~Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.~~

~~Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.~~

~~Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.~~

~~Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.~~

~~Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.~~

~~MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.~~

~~Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $1,066,000.~~

~~March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.~~

~~McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.~~

~~McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.~~

~~Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.~~

~~Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.~~

~~Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.~~

~~Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.~~

~~Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.~~

~~Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.~~

~~Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,505,000.~~

~~Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.~~

~~Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.~~

~~Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.~~

~~Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.~~

~~TACTICAL AIR COMMAND~~

~~Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.~~

~~England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.~~

~~George Air Force Base Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $2,222,000.~~

~~Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.~~

~~Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.~~

~~Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $672,000.~~

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $3,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $715,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $77,405,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,249,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facil-

ities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,352,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Supply facilities, and utilities, $374,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $8,590,000.

UNITED STATES SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative

facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $443,541,000.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a

final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

~~Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.~~

~~Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.~~

~~Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.~~

~~Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.~~

~~Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.~~

~~High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.~~

~~Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.~~

~~Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.~~

~~Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.~~

~~Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.~~

~~Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.~~

~~Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilties.~~

~~Classified locations, 343 units and community facilities.~~

~~(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646),~~ as

amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 300 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 180 units.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 350 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 300 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 470 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 285 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 260 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

Loring Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 320 units.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 550 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 300 units.

Travis Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 260 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 400 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000".

(b) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85-685, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base,

Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85-685, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section

355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $86,505,000; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $83,330,000; section 103, $5,000,000; or a total of $199,045,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $113,954,000; outside the United States, $42,265,000; section 202, $21,765,000; section 203, $5,000,000; or a total of $182,984,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $295,100,000; outside the United States, $65,081,000; section 302, $443,541,000; section 303, $5,000,000; or a total of $808,722,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside

the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be exe-

cuted under the jurisdiction and supervision of another Department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in

part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended;

(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 507 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

~~(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);~~

~~(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);~~

~~(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);~~

~~(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);~~

~~(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;~~

~~(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading INSIDE THE UNITED STATES"~~

and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 669), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson, South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326).

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facil-

ities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (3) housing units leased

for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor

area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 410. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 411. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 412. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78) is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000."

SEC. 413. Titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.

Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.

Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.

Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.

Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.

Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.

Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

~~Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.~~

~~Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.~~

~~Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.~~

~~Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.~~

~~Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.~~

~~Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.~~

~~Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.~~

~~Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.~~

~~Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.~~

~~Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.~~

~~Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.~~

~~Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.~~

~~Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.~~

~~Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.~~

~~East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.~~

~~El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.~~

~~Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.~~

~~Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.~~

~~Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.~~

~~Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.~~

~~Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.~~

~~Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.~~

~~Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.~~

~~Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.~~

~~Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.~~

~~Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.~~

~~Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.~~

~~Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.~~

~~Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.~~

~~Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.~~

~~Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.~~

~~Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.~~

~~New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.~~

~~Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.~~

~~Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.~~

~~Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.~~

~~Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.~~

~~Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.~~

~~Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.~~

~~Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.~~

~~Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.~~

~~San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.~~

~~San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.~~

~~San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.~~

~~Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.~~

~~Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.~~

~~Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.~~

~~Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.~~

~~Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.~~

~~Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.~~

~~Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.~~

~~Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.~~

~~Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.~~

~~San Jose, California: Parking lot and drill grounds, $1.~~

~~ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)~~

~~Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.~~

~~Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.~~

~~Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.~~

~~Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.~~

~~Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.~~

~~Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.~~

~~Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.~~

~~Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.~~

~~Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.~~

~~Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.~~

~~Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.~~

~~Colville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.~~

~~Dermott, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.~~

~~De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.~~

~~Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.~~

~~Dover, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.~~

~~Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.~~

~~Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.~~

~~Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.~~

~~Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.~~

~~Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.~~

~~Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.~~

~~Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.~~

~~Heber Springs, Arkansas: Training facilities, $90,000.~~

~~Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.~~

~~Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.~~

~~Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.~~

~~Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.~~

~~Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.~~

~~Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.~~

~~Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.~~

~~Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.~~

~~Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.~~

~~New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.~~

~~Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.~~

~~Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.~~

~~Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.~~

~~Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.~~

~~Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.~~

~~Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.~~

~~Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.~~

~~Riverdale, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.~~

~~Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.~~

~~Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.~~

~~Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.~~

~~Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.~~

~~Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.~~

~~Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.~~

~~Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.~~

~~Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.~~

~~Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.~~

Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.

Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.

Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.

~~Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.~~"

~~Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.~~

~~Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.~~

~~Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.~~

~~Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.~~

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

~~Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.~~

~~Naval Reserve Electronics facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.~~

~~Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.~~

~~Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.~~

~~Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.~~

~~Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.~~

~~Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.~~

~~Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.~~

~~Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.~~

~~MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)~~

~~Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.~~

~~Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.~~

~~Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.~~

~~Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.~~

~~Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.~~

~~(3) For Department of the Air Force:~~

~~AIR FORCE RESERVE~~

~~Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities and operational facilities, $364,000.~~

~~Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.~~

~~Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.~~

~~General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.~~

~~O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.~~

~~Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.~~

~~Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.~~

~~Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and troop housing, $188,000.~~

~~AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES~~

~~Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.~~

~~New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.~~

~~Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.~~

~~Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Utilities and ground improvements, $4,963,000.~~

~~Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $426,000.~~

~~Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.~~

~~Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.~~

~~Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.~~

~~Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.~~

~~Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.~~

~~Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.~~

~~Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.~~

~~Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.~~

~~Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.~~

~~Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.~~

~~Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.~~

~~Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.~~

~~Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee:~~

Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $192,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any

facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided,* That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85-685 is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85-685 is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85-685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85-685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 3 of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."

"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $$130,000."

"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85-685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000;" and by striking out in clause

~~(2) (b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place thereof "$12,446,000;" and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,702,000".~~

~~SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.~~

~~SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—~~

~~(1) for Department of the Army:~~

~~(a) Army Reserve, $20,748,000;~~

~~(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,451,000;~~

~~(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;~~

~~(3) for Department of the Air Force:~~

~~(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;~~

~~(b) Air National Guard of the United States $15,536,000.~~

~~SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1) (a), (1) (b), (2), (3) (a), and (3) (b) of section 504, respectively.~~

~~SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959."~~

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site for a United States Army Reserve Center: *Provided,* That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the

~~United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.~~

~~SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellanous receipts except that any moneys received under section 601 (2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged.~~

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,543,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

Columbus General Depot, Ohio: Utilities, $2,783,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities. $3,230,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, research development, and test facilities, and utilities, $628,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,541,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $958,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $2,636,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,260,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $620,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $553,000.

Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.

Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $13,194,000.

Outside the United States

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259,000.

Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.

Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $81,830,000.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land

acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the

Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.

Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.

Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.

Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.

Fort Ord, California, 500 units.

Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

Outside the United States

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

Sec. 105. Nothing contained in section 102 of Public Law 85–685 shall be construed to authorize the acquisition or development after the date of enactment of this Act of any real property for use as a site for the installation or operation of the Nike-Hercules or Nike-Ajax defense missiles within the continental United States or the Hawaiian Islands unless one or more contracts for the development of that site have been entered into before the date of enactment of this Act, and the Secretary of Defense determines that the completion thereof is in the interest of the national defense.

Sec. 106. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "technical services facilities (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "technical services

FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,497,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities, $701,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $24,554,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Station)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,851,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,050,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,000,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $457,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real Estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-

manent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $18,495,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works proj-

ects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to con-

struct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 450 units.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine

Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istan-

bul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and "$337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs Area, Colorado: Operational facilities and real estate, $10,000,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,234,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $255,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mis-

souri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,180,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,000,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research,

development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $787,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,452,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,980,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $807,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,168,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $20,000,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Supply facilities and ground improvements, $187,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,475,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,071,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $1,461,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,661,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $712,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,

supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,098,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $557,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $2,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $505,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $77,651,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,199,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,778,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Utilities, $106,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $15,160,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $443,541,000.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including

land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $15,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign

currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwaters RAF station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, Community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified locations, 1,083 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, 100 units.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 400 units.

Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, 160 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 100 units.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 200 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 400 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 670 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 520 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 470 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

Loring Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 100 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 530 units.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 820 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 400 units.

Travis Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 200 units.

Schilling Air Force Base, Kansas, 200 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000".

(b) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by

striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85-685, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with rspect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85-685 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,-239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734

of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $65,900,000; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $81,830,000; section 103, $10,000,000; or a total of $181,940,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $110,646,000; outside the United States, $29,550,000: section 202, $18,495,000; section 203, $10,000,000; or a total of $168,691,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $289,746,000; outside the United States, $71,759,000; section 302, $443,541,000; section 303, $15,000,000; or a total of $820,046,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the

United States for performance within the United States, its Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 507 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation

in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 944);

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of

$700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson, South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326): Provided, That the unit cost per bed does not exceed $16,000.

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955

(69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual mili-

tary construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622): Provided, That not more than five thousand units shall be contracted for under the authority of such section prior to June 30, 1964; and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. The Secretary of a military department may acquire by lease for indefinite periods of time real property in the Ryukyu Islands needed by the United States Government. Rentals for such leases may be paid in advance from appropriations available for operation and maintenance except advance payments for periods in excess of five years which shall be from appropriations available for military construction.

SEC. 410. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of

1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 411. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 412. Notwithstanding the authorizations for the

construction of family housing contained in subsections 104(b), 204(b), and 304(b) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for during fiscal year 1960 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of twenty-one thousand five hundred units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this section. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department.

SEC. 413. No money may be appropriated after December 31, 1959, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the design, development, or procurement of any aircraft or missile unless the appropriation of such money has been specifically authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

SEC. 414. Section 109(a) of Public Law 85-685 (72 Stat. 636, 641) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "However, the Secretary of the Army shall not make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, for sale pursuant to this section, such lands, or interests therein, not exceeding

one hundred and eighteen acres for channel straightening, and four hundred acres for a temporary spoil disposal area for a period of ten years, as the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary for the improvement or maintenance of the Houston Ship Channel Project."

SEC. 415. Section 403 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) On request by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General shall furnish to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, an opinion as to the sufficiency of title to any property on which it is proposed to construct housing, or on which housing has been constructed, under this section. If the opinion of the Attorney General is that the title to any such property is good and sufficient, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to guarantee, or enter into a commitment to guarantee, the mortgagee, under a mortgage on such property which is insured under title VIII of the National Housing Act, against any losses that may thereafter arise from adverse claims to title. None of the proceeds of any mortgage loan hereafter insured under such title VIII shall be used for title search and title insurance costs."

SEC. 416. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any

building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 417. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78), is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000."

SEC. 418. Titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Aberdeen, South Dakota: Training facilities, $168,000.

Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.

Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.

Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.

Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.

Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.

Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.

Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.

Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.

Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.

Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.

Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities. $602,000.

Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.

East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.

El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.

Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.

Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.

Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.

Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.

Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.

Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.

Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.

New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.

Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.

Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.

Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition. $61,000.

Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.

San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.

San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.

San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.

Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.

Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.

Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.

Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.

Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.

San Jose, California: Parking lot and drill grounds, $1.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.

Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.

Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.

Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.

Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.

Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.

Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.

Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.

Colville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.

Dover, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.

Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.

Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.

Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.

Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.

Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.

Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.

Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.

Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.

Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.

Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.

Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.

Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Riverdale, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.

Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.

Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.

San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.

Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.

Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.

Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.

Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.

Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.

Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities and operational facilities, $364,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and troop housing, $188,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Bradley Field, Hartford, Connecticut: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $591,000.

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

Gore Field, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance and operational facilities, $665,000.

Gowen Field, Boise, Idaho: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $3,222,000.

Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Ontario Municipal Airport, Ontario, California: Training facilities, $233,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $430,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Tucson Municipal Airport, Tucson, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection: Provided, That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United

States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85-685, is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85-685 is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85-685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina,

strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85-685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 3 of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."

"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."

"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85-685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000;" and by striking out in clause (2)(b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place thereof "$12,446,000;" and by striking out in clause (3) of

section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,702,000".

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army Reserve, $20,916,000;

(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,316,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States $15,580,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1)(a), (1)(b), (2), (3)(a), and (3)(b) of section 504, respectively.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959."

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated

on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site for a United States Army Reserve Center: Provided, That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer

and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.

SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts except that any moneys received under section 601 (2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged.

Passed the House of Representatives April 16, 1959.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 284

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5674

[Report No. 296]

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

APRIL 17 (legislative day, APRIL 15), 1959
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MAY 19, 1959
Reported with an amendment

AN ACT

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 21, 1959
For actions of May 20, 1959
86th-1st, No. 81

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriations.....18
Appropriations 6,17,18,19,44
CCC.....22
CCC investigation.....2
Commodity loans.....18,21
Conservation.....15
Cotton.....3
Economic report.....27
Education.....38
Eggs.....28
Electrification.....29
Farm housing.....22
Farm program.....1,34
Fats and oils.....9
Flood protection.....16,42
Foreign currencies.....7
Forestry.....14,20,26
Housing.....22
Labor standards.....39
Lands.....43
Legislative program.....17
Marketing.....41
Natural resources.....25
Peanuts.....3
Personal property.....35
Personnel.....13,35
Price supports.....1
Public Law 480.....7
Purchasing.....36
REA.....22
Recreation.....40
Reorganization.....8,23
Research.....12,22
Rice.....3,30
Roads.....10,37
School lunch.....1
Soil and water laboratory.....12
Soil bank.....32
Stockpile.....1
Sugar.....11
Tobacco.....3,4,22
Transportation.....31
Water resources.....16
Watersheds.....5
Wheat.....1,3,24,33

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed agricultural appropriation bill. Sen. Capehart urged either repeal of price support laws or increase in price support payments. Senate committee appointed subcommittee to investigate CCC operations. Senate to consider tobacco price support bill today. Senate passed over consideration of wheat price support bill. Received from President International Sugar Agreement.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Capehart submitted and discussed amendments to S. 1968, to modify price supports and acreage allotments for wheat. He stated that his amendments would repeal all price supports on farm commodities beginning Jan. 1, 1960, would freeze the surplus stockpile, except for certain purposes, would permit sale from the stockpile for export, for the school lunch program, and for grants to feed hungry people, and would permit the President to sell in the domestic market anything from the stockpile at 100 percent of parity. He stated that "Either we must repeal the price support laws, which my amendment would do, or we must go back to 90 to 100 percent of parity, because the system under which we are operating will not work," and that "We cannot continue to

spend $5 billion a year on price supports, or $6½ billion a year to operate the Department of Agriculture, when all that is being accomplished is the building up of further surpluses, without doing any good for the farmers." Sen. Humphrey criticized administration farm policies, and stated that Sen. Capehart "has stated for us quite clearly what he believes to be the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration." Sen. Capehart replied that he had not discussed his proposal with anyone. pp. 7761-5

2. CCC INVESTIGATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee appointed a special subcommittee to investigate activities and operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and all activities related thereto. Members of the subcommittee are Sens. Symington, Chairman, Humphrey, Talmadge, Proxmire, Young, N. Dak., and Williams, Del. p. D374

3. WHEAT. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Engle, S. 1968, to revise price supports and acreage allotments for wheat. p. 7728

The committee report on the bill states that it would:

"(1) Provide price support at --

"(i) 65 percent of parity if the producer elects to plant his full allotment,

"(ii) 80 percent of parity if he elects to plant not more than 80 percent of his allotment;

"(2) Impose penalties on the actual yield of the excess acres (or double the normal yield if the actual yield is not shown);

"(3) Increase the marketing penalty to the basic support rate applicable to those who elect to plant their full allotment (65 percent of pairty);

"(4) Reduce the 15-acre exemption to 12, and restrict it to farms which planted wheat in 1957, 1958, or 1959 and to producers who produce wheat on only one farm;

"(5) Make the 200-bushel exemption inapplicable;

"(6) Prohibit price support (A) outside the commercial area and (B) if acreage allotments are not in effect; and

"(7) Restrict to farms complying with their allotments the right to withdraw wheat stored from a previous crop to avoid penalty.

"The bill would also permanently repeal authority to support prices to non-cooperators for wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, or tobacco."

4. TOBACCO. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Engle, S. 1901, to modify price supports for tobacco. Sen. Mansfield announced that this bill will be taken up Thurs., May 21. pp. 7729, 7760-1

5. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved the following watershed projects: American Fork-Dry Creek, Utah; Big Park, Iowa; Jennings, Tenn.; and Little Paint Creek, Ala. p. D374

6. APPROPRIATIONS.. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 5676, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1960. p. D374

7. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Engle, H. R. 5674, to authorize construction at military installations, including provisions for the use of foreign currencies received under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing. p. 7728

8. REORGANIZATION. Passed over, on objection by Sen. Long, S. 1474, to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949 for two years, until June 1, 1961. pp. 7712-3

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF VARIOUS COMMISSIONS REGARDING THE NEED FOR UNIFORM COST-SHARING POLICIES WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO FLOOD CONTROL

"Task Force Report on Natural Resources," prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, January 1949 (First Hoover Commission):

"When the Federal Government first assumed definite responsibility for flood protection in 1936, costs were to be shared by the States and localities benefited, largely through the contribution of lands and rights-of-way. Removal of this condition in 1938 with respect to reservoir projects has had the effect not only of making the Federal Government assume 100 percent of the costs of these flood-control projects, but has removed one of the most effective restraints on the undertaking of projects of doubtful feasibility. States and localities were certain to scrutinize proposed projects with great care when they had to bear a significant share of the cost, but are inclined to ask fewer questions when the Federal Government supplies all the funds" (p. 21).

"The existence of a number of survey and development agencies has encouraged the perpetuation of special-purpose policies and has accentuated statutory inconsistencies. Varying administrative standards of feasibility, benefit-cost evaluation, and cost allocation have added to the confusion in these areas. Interagency rivalry has fostered a sort of Gresham's law with respect to Federal financial policies, the tendency being for higher standards of repayment by State, local, and private beneficiaries to be replaced by lower" (p. 23).

"Although the committee is not prepared to make specific recommendations, it believes that the most pressing need for statutory revision has to do with financial policy. As a general principle, costs should be repaid as far as practicable by the beneficiaries, more so than at present. Federal contributions should be limited to amounts proportionate to the estimated national benefits involved. State and local contributions should be required where practicable as a regular policy on all projects where localized benefits demonstrably exist" (p. 28).

"A Water Policy for the American People," the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, 1950 (Cooke Commission):

"This proposed reformulation of water resources policy is constructed on a simple framework of principles. These express: * * * The necessity for a system of repayment designed to treat alike all who enjoy the advantages of Federal investment. This will seek reasonable repayment, either through direct charge or assessment, for the opportunity which water resources programs offer for private gain, but will recognize that the great contributions of such programs to the general welfare warrant the assumption by the Federal Government of the remainder of the cost" (p. 9).

"Congress, in drafting new legislation or amending existing legislation, should provide for a uniform national reimbursement policy and specify the principles to be applied.

"Reimbursement procedure should aim, as far as possible, to recover a reasonable portion of the benefits accruing from public expenditures for water resources development. This should provide for charges for benefits where they can be collected, and agreements with interest States under which they would utilize their powers of taxation or assessment to assure reimbursement to the Federal Government for primary and secondary benefits not susceptible direct collection" (p. 12).

"From the foregoing discussion, it should be clear that the Nation has no consistent reimbursement policy in relaiton to water resources development. In general, this situation has developed out of piecemeal legislation and administrative decisions dealing with single projects or with single functions within river basins. This procedure has given rise to serious inequities and inconsistencies in reimbursement policy.

"In the case of local flood control works, the local communities directly affected should assume an appropriate share of the cost, which could be apportioned on the basis of property values either by general taxation or by special assessment.

"In the case of extensive flood control works, involving large-scale upstream storage and land management programs, the States should establish special districts with the adequate powers to assume an appropriate share of the cost of providing protection against floods" (p. 85).

"Missouri: Land and Water," report of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission, 1953 (Lawrence Commission):

"Greater local financial responsibility: The general trend toward lower reimbursement requirements should be reversed. The problem is nationwide and application in any basin should obviously be conditioned on revisions being incorporated in national policy. Specifically, the Commission recommends that consideration be given to:

"(a) A general revision in national policy for the division of financial responsibility between Federal, State, and local groups in order to obtain higher contributions toward costs by beneficiaries, more systematic cost-sharing requirements for the various purposes, and greater interest and willingness to assume responsibility by groups immediately affected.

"(b) Provisions in national policy for assigning charges and assessments to specified beneficiaries in accordance with the following general principles: * * *.

"Flood control: Primary beneficiaries, communities, and areas directly concerned, including States, should be assigned assessments up to the value of benefits, subject to reliable identification and measurement, with allowance for incentives and repayment ability" (pp. 15–16).

Local contribution to resource development: State and local interests could bear a greater share of the costs of projects from which benefits accrue to them. This is particularly true for flood control and navigation projects which for the most part are charged off as nonreimbursable, with the result that the Federal Government is bearing almost the entire cost.

"However, the entire cast of major projects should not be borne by local groups, despite the fact that the large share of benefits from these projects accrue to local interests. It would be impossible for the local governmental or private bodies to finance the entire, or perhaps even the major share of the costs of such projects. Nevertheless, the Commission is convinced that contribution or repayment policies are in need of revision in order to lessen the burden on the Nation as a whole and to stimulate the local groups within the basin to shoulder a larger portion of the financial burden. The Commission has continually encountered the demand that State and local governments be given a greater share in the determination and administration of the basin program, and it believes that this demand must be accompanied by an explicit willingness to combine administrative responsibility with financial support" (p. 16).

"Cost-sharing policy should promote: Greater consistency in the cost-sharing requirements for the various resource development programs. Some of the variations in current practice cannot be justified in terms of any systematic set of principles" (p. 234).

"Water Resources Policy," a report by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, 1955 (summary and major conclusions):

"It is believed that the principle of equal contribution for equal benefits received should be applied to the beneficiaries of all Federal water resources developments, although it is recognized that historically, the programs of the Federal agencies have differed widely as to the contribution required from the beneficiaries of such projects" (p. 3).

"Identifiable beneficiaries should pay an appropriate share of the cost of projects. The Committee believes that in most instances, direct identifiable beneficiaries should pay a larger share of the cost for benefits received than they now do.

"Responsibility for bearing the cost of maintenance and operation of Federal projects and for their management should be turned over to non-Federal interests as soon as it is soundly feasible in consideration of the Federal investment.

"All Federal agencies should use a uniform approach to cost sharing so that the division of costs between the Federal Government and non-Federal interests for any particular project would be the same regardless of the agency undertaking the project" (p. 30).

"The Committee recommends, as a general policy, that all interstate participate in the cost of projects in accordance with the measure of their benefits, and that the Federal Government assume the cost of that part of projects where the benefits are widely dispersed and represent substantial contributions to the general economic growth of the country or region, or to the national defense. The division of costs between Federal and non-Federal entities should be equitably determined on the basis of the degree and character of the respective interests, and the ability to identify direct beneficiaries. There the project is primarily of a local character, and where beneficiaries are readily identifiable, the Federal Government's contribution should be limited, with the non-Federal interests bearing a substantial portion of the construction costs of the project as well as the replacement, maintenance, and operation costs. In cases where projects supply or safeguard national needs, or where there are other special compelling considerations, the Federal Government may bear a larger portion of the cost if found in each case to be justified and consistent with criteria established by the Coordinator of Water Resources" (p. 31).

Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power to Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, June 1955 (second Hoover Commission):

"It is recommended, to assure that the Federal payment of project costs is kept within reasonable bounds, and that non-Federal beneficiaries pay or repay costs commensurate with their benefits—

"That the Congress enact legislation to establish cost distribution principles, which 'cohesive and clearly identifiable groups receiving substantial benefits' will be required to observe as a prerequisite of Federal participation in reclamation projects; to require that the appropriate Federal agency report on conformance of local groups in recommending projects to the Congress; and to include the following requirements in the principles:

"(a) That the benefits expected to result from any project be subdivided as follows:

"1. those accruing to groups of cohesive and clearly identifiable recipients of substantial benefits.

"2. all benefits not assignable to such groups.

"(b) That the allocated capital cost be distributed in proportion to the benefits assigned.

"(c) That financially responsible governmental or quasi-governmental agencies rep-

resenting the groups of cohesive and clearly identifiable recipients of substantial benefits be required, as a condition of Federal participation, to bind themselves to pay at least 50 percent of the cost prorated to them under (b) above with interest.

"(d) That the Federal Government assume all other costs not assumed by such groups.

"(e) That, in general, non-Federal agencies assume the full cost of operation and maintenance" (pp. 98–99).

"Sharing of cost by non-Federal interests: A fair share of the cost of any project which the Federal Government either constructs, or contributes to, should be borne by those to whom substantial benefits accrue. This will reduce the drain upon the Federal Treasury. But it will do three even more important things: It will constitute insurance that the local interests are really convinced of the soundness of the projects; it will result in a more equitable distribution of costs, and; it will preserve the self-respect of the beneficiaries.

"All of the Commissions and other groups which have given mature consideration to water-resources development have supported the principle that beneficiaries should bear an equitable share of costs.

"Nevertheless, present laws are not, in general, in accord with this principle" (p. 758).

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING REIMBURSEMENT FOR NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS

Task Force Report on Natural Resources, prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, January 1949 (first Hoover Commission):

"Under present methods of developing flood control and navigation works, the immediate beneficiaries often do not have to pay directly any significant part of the cost. Their only contribution is through general taxation. Indeed, they are encouraged by this policy to promote costly projects which cost them nothing. Such subsidy of private individuals from the public treasury is at best unjust. Its greatest evil, however, arises from the removal of any sort of economic measure of value in terms of willingness to pay. It seems reasonable to assume that if the direct beneficiaries refuse to pay any part of the project costs, the economic soundness of the project must indeed be questionable" (p. 87).

"A Water Policy for the American People," the Report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, 1950 (Cooke Commission):

"Reimbursement for various types of benefits from water resources programs should be determined in accordance with the following principles: * * * (c) for navigation it should be determined in connection with a general program for putting charges for all forms of transportation on a cost basis, including interest'" (pp. 12–13).

"Decisions as to user charges, or tolls, for waterway commerce should be worked out as a part of the whole problem of reconciling and making workable a coordinated transportation system. But with rates for all forms of transportation based on full costs, an interconnected system of modern waterways, coordinated with land transportation, should be able to sustain itself with tolls based on full costs and yield returns on the public investment while contributing to the most economic use of the Nation's resources" (p. 16).

"Greater local financial responsibility: The general trend toward lower reimbursement requirements should be reversed. The problem is nationwide, and application in any basin should obviously be conditioned on revisions being incorporated in national policy. Specifically, the Commission recommends that consideration be given to:

* * * * *

"(b) Provisions in national policy for assigning charges and assessments to specified beneficiaries in accordance with the following general principles:

* * * * *

"Navigation: An assignment should be made to waterway users and, through agreement, to States and communities to the extent of their benefits, after allowance for incentives. Such assignments may partly be met by toll charges, if and when feasible" (pp. 15–16).

"Water Resources Policy," a report by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, 1955."

"Navigation: Serious consideration should be given to repayment of a portion of the costs of new navigation projects, particularly those which will create navigability where none now exists, by the institution of user charges. Although it would appear logical, in the interest of a completely uniform policy as to the participation of beneficiaries in the costs of water resources developments, that user charges should be instituted which would at least bear the cost of operation and maintenance of such navigation facilities, it must be recognized that the subject of user charges involves not only water policy but also the whole field of transportation, including many other mediums. Therefore it is a more appropriate subject for a survey of the entire field of transportation than one of water policy alone" (p. 32).

Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power to Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, June 1955 (Second Hoover Commission):

"It is recommended, to help establish a consistent national water policy, to increase local responsibility, and to fix the limits of Federal activities in the development and conservation of water resources and power.

"That the Congress enact legislation to direct the appropriate Federal agency or agencies to apply the principles of national transportation policy, as expressed in the preamble of the Transportation Act of 1940, to the construction, operation, and maintenance of navigation facilities.

"That the Congress enact legislation to establish a system of user charges relating to the inland and intracoastal waterways, the Great Lakes and connecting channels, and seacoast harbors and channels of the United States. For projects now in operation, such charges should cover all costs of maintenance and operation by whatever agency incurred. ("For future projects (including future capital expenditures for projects now in operation), the charges should cover all Federal costs, i.e., maintenance, operation, and capital costs. All such charges should apply to regions, or system, rather than to individual projects, so as to avoid discrimination" (p. 101).

"Water Resources and Power," report of Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, June 30, 1955. (Second Hoover Commission):

"Recommendation No. 8:

"That Congress authorize a user charge on inland waterways except for smaller pleasure craft, sufficient to cover maintenance and operation, and authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix such charges" (p. 85).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 962) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the modification of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway-Channel to Port Mansfield, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document 11, of the Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,431,000.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT FOR KAHULUI HARBOR ISLAND OF MAUI, HAWAII

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1632) authorizing the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "for", to strike out "Kahuli" and insert "Kahului", and in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "$964,800" and insert "$944,500 to the United States for construction", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document Numbered 109, of the Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of $944,500 to the United States for construction.

SEC. 20. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill authorizing the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1968) to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price support program was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, by request I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that all the items from No. 284 to the end of the calendar be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be passed over.

The bills passed over are as follows:

H.R. 5674. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 15, 1959
For actions of June 12, 1959
86th-1st, No. 97

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....42
Adjournment.....19,29
Alaska.....3
Appropriations..13,15,18,21
Archelogical data.....7
Atomic energy.....13
Centennial celebration....8
Electrification.....37
Experiment stations.....22
Farm credit.....12
Farm loans.....1,4,17
Farm program.....26,30
Feed grains.....42
Foreign aid.....28
Foreign currencies.....9
Forestry.....15,21
4-H Clubs.....34
Health.....38
Interest rates.....31
Lands.....14,39
Legislative program...18,28
Military construction.....9
Personnel.....25,33,38
Patents.....40
Postal rates.....6
Poultry.....17
Price supports.....1,42
Prices.....23
Public debt.....31
Public works.....24
Reorganization.....10
Research.....5,11
School lunch.....17
Stockpiling.....36
Surplus food.....16
Taxation.....27
Tobacco.....1
Transportation.....41
Wages.....23
Water utilization.....5
Water resources.....32
Wheat.....2,20,35

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed wheat bill. Conferees were appointed in both Houses. Senate concurred in House amendment to tobacco price support bill. House received conference report on Interior appropriation bill (includes FS). Senate passed bill to extend authority for refinancing farm loans. Senate passed over bill to provide for centennial celebration of establishment of USDA and land-grant colleges. Sens. Johnston and Neuberger and Rep. Morrison introduced and Sen. Johnston discussed Federal employee health bill.

SENATE

1. TOBACCO. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 1901, which provides that tobacco price supports shall be 90% of parity computed under the new or old formula, whichever is lower (pp. 9583-4). This bill will now be sent to the President. The House amendment limited to $50,000 the total amount of CCC loans or purchases made to any person on the 1960 production of tobacco.

2. WHEAT. Sen. Humphrey commended the action of the House in passing S. 1968, the wheat bill, and expressed hope that Senate conferees will agree with the House action. pp. 9634-5

   Sen. Proxmire inserted a newspaper article, "The State of Congress," commenting on the status of legislation, including the lack of agreement "on a wheat program, let alone a basic change in the disastrous farm program generally." p. 9576

3. ALASKA. Agreed to the House amendment to H. R. 7120, to amend certain laws of the U. S. in light of the admission of Alaska into the Union (p. 9575). This bill will now be sent to the President.

4. FARM LOANS. Passed without amendment S. 1941, to amend Sec. 17 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to continue the authority of FHA to make real estat loans for refinancing farm debts for two years, until June 30, 1961. p. 9589

5. WATER UTILIZATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 1306, to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act so as to permit delivery of water for use by Washington State College for research purposes (pp. 9584-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.

6. POSTAL RATES. Passed without amendment H. R. 5212, to revise the minimum charge on pieces of mail of odd sizes and shapes (p. 9587). This bill will now be sent to the President.

7. ARCHELOGICAL DATA. Passed without amendment S. 1185, to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data which might otherwise be lost as a result of the construction of a dam. p. 9592

8. CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Engle, H. R. 4012, to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges and State universities. p. 9587

Sen. Wiley urged passage of this bill and inserted a statement on the purpose of the centennial observances. pp. 9577-8

9. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Engle, H. R. 5674, to authorize construction at military installations, including the use of foreign currencies under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing. p. 9584

10. REORGANIZATION PLANS. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Engle, H. R. 5140, to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so as to extend the time in which the Act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to Congress at any time before June 1, 1961. p. 9588

11. RESEARCH. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Engle, S. 864, to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry. p. 9589

12. FARM CREDIT. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Engle, S. 1513, to clarify the status of the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the banks for cooperatives and their officers and employees with respect to certain laws applicable to officers and employees of the U. S.; and S. 1512 to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks. p. 9589

13. APPROPRAITIONS. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Engle, S. 2094, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. p. 9592

14. LAND. Passed as reported S. 1521, to provide for the removal of restrictions on use with respect to a tract of land in Cumberland Co., Tenn., formerly under the jurisdiction of FHA, which was conveyed to Tenn. pp. 9596

to our benevolent purposes and our sometimes overpat practical solutions for the world's woes. Most of us belong to the revolutionary people, like the Irish, or the warmblooded races, like the Latin, and so we tend to sign up fairly rapidly in any crusades—crusades for economic, political and related changes designed to solve by a speech or two, or a campaign or two, or an election or two, or a war or two, the entrenched problems and accumulated evils of several centuries. We tend to take personal offense at the inertia of the world in the face of our inspiring convictions. This is particularly true when we are confronted by exasperating rejection of or dalliance with the corollaries of a creed which we know to be divinely revealed and to echo God's will for mankind, but which sometimes has rough going against the indifference and the inertia of unregenerate mankind.

Here we do well to have a little bit of God's patience, to offset our generous share of God's wrath. A little patience in the face of what we cannot change, at least alone and overnight, will be helped by reflection on the persevering patience of the church across the centuries, and the silent patience of God in the face of evil, our own included. So too some lines of Coventry Patmore may help a bit:

"Here in this little bay, full of tumultous life and great repose,
Where twice a day the purposeless glad ocean comes and goes,
In the high cliffs and far from the huge town I sit me down.

"For want of me the world's course will not fail,
When all its work is done the lies shall rot.
The truth is great and shall prevail
When none cares whether it prevail or not."

I merely ask you to develop a little imagination and, together with it, a little humility.

The golden jubilee of those who today receive their degrees will take place, if all goes well, in June 2009. It is too soon to know on which of the planets the class outing will be held. But the odds still favor this earth and even, though less certainly, this continent. These odds have been challenged, however, in recent months. They were challenged by a trip into space successfully accomplished within the fortnight by two monkeys, one named Able and the other named Baker. They were also challenged, and a little more definitely so, by a trip into space by a dog from Russia named Laiki. Both the monkeys, I am happy to say, were Americans. These three historic creatures have as I have suggested already greatly influenced the golden jubilee plans for the year 2009. These same creatures and all the developments of which they are symbols make it pertinent for you to develop a little imagination and a little humility as we face the future.

The new age of Science, using telescopes instead of microscopes and gazing out into God's clear space instead of down into mind's murky psychological depths as the recent scientists have tended to do, will let fresh air into scientific, political, economic, academic thinking of every kind in the half century in which you will do your work. In such era it will be easy for the spirit moving where it will to evoke more ready response. An age of astronomy, the prospect of interplanetary studies and even journeys, these are far removed from the introspective broodings and the negative agnosticism which were the frequent but unnecessary by-products of the 19th century scientists. The directions of the age in which you will live will be quite literally toward the heavens, and once again those with a little patience, a little humor, a little leisure for reflection and repose and meditation, a little impatience with the status quo, a little humility and a little imagination will understand better than have generations what the Hebrew Psalmist meant when he wrote:

"I look up at those heavens of Thine, the work of Thy hands, at the moon and the stars which Thou hast set in their places, and I ask, 'What is man that Thou shouldst remember him; what is Adam's breed that it should claim Thy care? And yet Thou hast placed him only a little below the angels, crowning him with glory and honor and bidding him rule over the works of Thy hand'."

Georgetown has prepared you to do some part of that ruling, with a little luck and a little prayer and a little reflection on your gratitude to the university and those who made possible your attendance at it, and the God who is able to make great things out of little virtues.

God bless you.

CONFERRING OF DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF HUMANE LETTERS UPON SENATOR GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the University of Georgetown at its commencement exercises on June 8, the 160th annual commencement of that great university at Georgetown, and within the area of the seat of the government of the United States, honored itself by honoring our beloved colleague, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island.

The Senator from Rhode Island, as everybody knows, is a man of advanced years, but no Member of the Senate, and I am sure no Member of the other House of Congress, has ever seen a man carry the burden of more than 90 years so lightly as does the Senator from Rhode Island.

The ability, the knowledge, the skill of the senior Senator from Rhode Island are known to us all. I felt it would be appropriate if I should seek the opportunity in the Senate, which has now been granted to me, to read into the RECORD the citation which was given by the president of Georgetown University, Father Edward B. Bunn, J.J., when he conferred the honorary degree of Doctor of humane letters upon our colleague. I read the citation:

To All Who Shall View This Document, Greetings and Peace in the Lord:

Men have ever deemed worthy of deep respect and deserving of peculiar honor those who by Heaven's favor have passed nine fruitful decades in the service of their compatriots and of all humanity. For it is but right to accord to all who excel the due reward of excellence. Respect is always deepened and regard rises to affection when in the prudent counselor, the energetic executive, the sincere patriot, his associates and fellow citizens see a man accessible to all, gentle and kind, loyal to his friends, ever desiring and effectively promoting the interests of his fellow men.

The statesman whom our university is delighted to honor at this commencement continued a long family tradition when he turned early to the practice of law. From court and academic hall he was called to a soldier's duties in the Spanish-American War. Once more, and for the many years to follow, the practice of law offered scope to outstanding talent and crowned tireless effort with conspicuous success. His fellow citizens of Rhode Island shared the fruits of a lengthening experience when they chose him as their representative in the State legislature, when they drew upon his counsel and inspiration during the trying days of World War I, when they twice elected him as Governor of their State. In this office he effectively supported measures designed to alleviate suffering and ameliorate conditions in a particularly trying period. From the highest office of his native State he was called, and called four times over, to the Senate of the United States. By his sponsorship and support of programs of social legislation and adequate national defense, and in particular by his untiring activity as member and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, he has for over twoscore years served his country well, at home and abroad. By his travels to several continents and his mastery of several languages he has advanced the causes of international amity and world peace.

It is, then, with the earnest desire that he see many more years of service, that he gather in ever more abundant measure the fine fruits of a full life, and that he remain for his juniors a shining example of unremitting toil, steadfast purpose, and unswerving principles, that the president and directors of Georgetown University create and proclaim THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

In testimony whereof we have duly issued these letters under our hand and the seal of the university this 8th day of June 1959.

EDWARD B. BUNN, S.J.,
President.
JOSEPH A. SELLINGER, S.J.,
Secretary.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1949, TO STABILIZE SUPPORT FOR TOBACCO

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1901) to amend section 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the act of July 28, 1945, to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco, which were, on page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "*And provided further,*" and insert "*Provided further,*" and on page 2, line 22, after "used" insert:

And provided further, That no part of this authorization shall be used to formulate or carry out a price support program for 1960 under which a total amount of price support in excess of $50,000 would be extended through loans or purchases made or made available by Commodity Credit Corporation to any person in the 1960 production of tobacco. For the purposes of this proviso, the term "person" shall mean an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or other legal entity, or a State, political subdivision of a State, or any agency thereof. In the case of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing organization, such limitation shall not apply to the amount of price support received by the cooperative marketing organization, but the amount of price support made available to any person through such cooperative marketing organization shall be included in determining the amount of price support received by such person for purposes of such limitation. Such limitation shall not apply to price support on tobacco extended by purchases of tobacco from, or by loans on tobacco to, persons other than the producers of tobacco if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitation. The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations prescribing such rules as he determines necessary to prevent the evasion of such limitation.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, S. 1901, the Tobacco Act, which was passed by the Senate and sent to the House of Representatives, was passed by the House of Representatives with a slight amendment or two. There is a limit of $50,000 on loans to one farmer.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion as agreed to.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Under the order previously entered, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 265. The clerk will state the first measure.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF MISSOURI

The bill (S. 692) to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Missouri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Missouri, for public park and recreational purposes only, such areas within the portion of Table Rock Dam and Reservoir project, Missouri, presently leased to said State for public park and recreational purposes, as he shall deem essential to provide building sites for permanent buildings and other improvements for public park and recreational purposes, but not to exceed fifty acres, at fair value as determined by him, which in no event shall be less than the cost to the Government of acquiring such areas, and under such terms and conditions as he shall deem advisable to assure that the use of said areas by the State will not interfere with the operation of said dam and reservoir project and such additional terms and conditions as he shall deem advisable in the public interest.

The conveyance authorized by this Act shall not pass any right, title, or interest in oil, gas, fissionable materials, or other minerals.

In the event actual construction of the said buildings and improvements has not commenced within five years from the effective date of this Act, or in the event said property shall cease to be used for public park and recreational purposes for a period of two successive years, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, since it is not properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LAURIE DEA HOLLEY AND KARMEN LAEL HOLLEY

The bill (S. 218) for the relief of Laurie Dea Holley and the legal guardian of Karmen Lael Holley, minor child, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Laurie Dea Holley of Cannonville, Utah, the sum of $5,000 and to the legal guardian of Karmen Lael Holley, minor child, $20,000 in full satisfaction, except as provided in section 2 of this Act, of their claim against the United States for the death of their husband and father, Elmer Leroy Holley, who was fatally injured in an accident which occurred on November 29, 1953, while he was engaged in the performance of his duties as an employee of the United States Senate Post Office.

SEC. 2. This Act or any payment made in accordance with its provisions shall not have the effect of destroying or changing any rights to compensation under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act resulting from such death.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 115) to authorize studies as to the effectiveness of present governmental organization and procedures for the development and execution of national policy for survival in the contest with world communism, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution go over, as not properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 69) proposing an amendment to the Constitution the United States relative to the equal rights for men and women, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution go over as not properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

FURNISHING OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT

The bill (H.R. 3292) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOANS OF NAVAL VESSELS TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF ITALY, TURKEY, AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The bill (H.R. 3366) to authorize the extension of loans of naval vessels to the Governments of Italy, Turkey, and the Republic of China was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT LANDS TO STATE OF WASHINGTON

The bill (H.R. 1306) to provide for the sale of Columbia Basin project lands to the State of Washington, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I deeply regret that I was not present in the Chamber when the call of the calendar was started. I was in attendance on other official business. Calendar No. 296, House bill 1306, was passed before I reached the Chamber.

Only for the purpose of legislative record I should like to engage in colloquy with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] in regard to House bill 1306, a bill to provide for the sale of Columbia Basin project lands to the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The bill would authorize the sale of not more than 640 acres of irrigable land on the Columbia Basin project to the State of Washington for use by the State College of Washington for agricultural research purposes. It provides that the land so conveyed shall be treated as nonexcess lands, under the Columbia Basin Project Act, insofar as deliveries of water from project works are concerned, so long as they are used for the purposes designated in the bill, namely, agricultural research.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Oregon will suspend until the Senate is in order.

Mr. MORSE. Under the Columbia Basin Project Act, the limitation on the acreage to which water may lawfully be delivered through a reclamation project is applicable to State-owned lands as well as private land. In the absence of this proposed amendment water could be delivered to no more than 160 acres of State-owned land.

It is my feeling that the acreage limitation provision of our Federal reclamation laws was not designed to be ap-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 26, 1959
For actions of June 25, 1959
86th-1st, No. 106

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....24
Adjournment.....12
Agricultural appropriations...3,11,26
Alaska.....25
Appropriations 3,11,20,26,32
Banking.....30
Budget.....6,18
Civil defense.....20
Claims.....20
Contracts.....27
Dairy.....14
Farm labor.....10
Farm program.....19
Federal-State relations.....8,17
Food for peace.....7
Foreign aid.....4,32
Foreign currencies.....4,9
Foreign trade.....5
Forestry.....13
Information.....31
Land management.....20
Legislative program.....11
Minerals.....13
Monopolies.....29
Mutual security.....4,32
Ocean freight.....4
Outdoor recreation.....20
Price supports..1,22,23,24
Public debt.....2
Public Law 480.....4,9
Regulatory agencies.....23
River basin.....20
State laws.....8,17
Surplus commodities.....4
Technical cooperation....4
Tobacco.....1,22,23
Transportation.....15,21
Wheat.....1,24
Wilderness.....16

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate received vetoes of wheat and tobacco bills. Sen. Cooper criticized veto of tobacco bill. Senate passed bill to increase public debt limit. Sen. Morton introduced and discussed tobacco price support bill.

SENATE

1. WHEAT; TOBACCO; PRICE SUPPORTS. Received from the President veto messages on S. 1968, the wheat bill (S. Doc. 33), and S. 1901, the tobacco bill (S. Doc. 32 p. 10876

   Sen. Cooper criticized the veto of the tobacco bill and stated that he would consult with representatives of the "tobacco States in Congress" and others "before I make a decision as to the course of action we shall now take." Sen. Talmadge commended Sen. Cooper's statement. pp. 10820-21.

2. PUBLIC DEBT. Passed without amendment H. R. 7749, to increase the permanent ceiling on the public debt from $283 billion to $285 billion, and to increase the temporary ceiling from $288 billion to $295 billion (pp. 10811-13, 10878-9). The bill had been reported earlier in the day without amendment by the Finance Committee (S. Rept. 432) p. 10774. This bill will now be sent to the President.

3. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees "continued, in executive session, to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H. R. 7175, fiscal 1960 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies, but did not conclude their work, and will meet again tomorrow." p. D532

4. MUTUAL SECURITY. As reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, S. 1451, to extend the mutual security program, includes provisions as follows: Requires that at least $175,000,000 (same amount as in last year's Act) of mutual security funds be used to finance the export and sale for foreign currencies of surplus agricultural commodities; authorizes $2,300,000 (last year's appropriation was $2,100,000) for ocean freight to move supplies donated to and by American voluntary agencies; and authorizes $179,500,000 for technical cooperation programs.

With regard to local currencies obtained from the sale of surplus commodites under Public Law 480, the committee report states:

"The committee is becoming increasingly concerned over the problems posed, both immediately and over the long term, by U. S. accumulation of large amounts of foreign currencies.***

"The committee hopes the executive branch will continue its studies of this subject and submit specific recommendations for congressional action. In the meantime the committee takes this opportunity to record its view that rather too restricted use has been made of the authority of the President under section 104 of Public Law 480 to waive the requirement of appropriations in the case of foreign currencies used for economic development grants.***

"Inability to utilize currencies in turn inhibits further sales under Public Law 480.***

"All countries in which there are large accumulations of Public Law 480 currencies have great needs for investment in projects such as roads, schools, and health facilities. Although the emphasis of the program should continue to be on loans, the committee feels that the Presidential waiver authority should be used more liberally to make grants."

5. FOREIGN TRADE. Received from the President message transmitting the third annual report on the operation of the trade agreements program (S. Doc. 31). p. 10773

6. BUDGET. Sen. Byrd, Va., inserted a resolution from the Controllers Institute of America urging adherence to a balanced budget in 1960 and in future years of normal economic activity. p. 10774

7. FOOD FOR PEACE. Sen. Fulbright stated that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hold hearings on S. 1711, the food for peace bill, on July 7 and 8. p. 10777

8. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. Sen. Dodd criticized H. R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation concerning the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, as passed by the House, as leading to "chaos in the field of Federal-State relationships," and stated that it is a "one-shot attempt to rewrite a century and a half of history." p. 10783

9. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. The Armed Services Committee reported an original bill S. 2280, to authorize construction at military installations, including the use of foreign currencies under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing construction (S. Rept. 434). p. 10883

A similar bill, H. R. 5674, was made the unfinished business for consideration Mon., June 29. p. 10879

But in our time we have not only continued exploitation of our resources; we have abandoned our traditional policy of fiscal soundness.

We have sapped our strength and undermined our form of government with continual deficit spending, rising debt, and spiraling inflation.

There can be no doubt that we have allowed ourselves to become weak in the fundamental requirement for fiscal soundness.

Development of our great resources through free enterprise democracy is the source of this Nation's strength.

With atomic energy, rocketry, etc., we are entering a new era. Our population is increasing. We have unduly exploited our resources, but they are still tremendous. Our productive know-how and capacity are yet unsurpassed.

These are elements on which free enterprise democracy should thrive soundly, and proceed constructively for the good of all mankind.

Our free enterprise democracy is the greatest system the world has ever evolved. But there is one controlling requirement, and this must never be overlooked. The system is based on solvent government and sound money.

With fiscal soundness I would have no fear for the future—economically or militarily. Without it there will be neither solid economic progress nor security with military preparedness.

We have allowed ourselves to grow weak in the requirement for solvent government and sound money. Assurance of fiscal soundness in the future does not now exist.

Deficit financing has been the rule—not the exception—for more than a quarter of a century.

The Secretary of the Treasury in testifying on this bill has set the objective of bringing the debt down to or under the $285 billion permanent limitation. This is essential.

To do this will require balanced budgets with surplus. If he is to achieve the objective, he will require firm action by the executive branch and constructive help by Congress in reduction of expenditures with elimination of all of those which are not absolutely essential.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate today passed the bill raising the permanent debt limit from $285 billion to $288 billion, and the temporary debt limit from $288 billion to $295 billion. Since there was no yea-and-nay vote on the bill, I wish to be recorded as being opposed to the passage of the bill.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 284, H.R. 5674, the military construction bill. I announce that this bill will be made the unfinished business and that it is expected to have the Senate take it up on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment.

SOVIET RUSSIA POSES A NEW INDUSTRIAL THREAT—ADDRESS BY DR. RAYMOND EWELL, VICE CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO, BEFORE BUFFALO BUSINESS BREAKFAST CLUB ON FEBRUARY 18, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech by Vice Chancellor Ewell, of the University of Buffalo, on the new industrial threat being made by the Soviet Union against the United States and on Mr. Ewell's recommendations for countering this threat.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET RUSSIA POSES A NEW INDUSTRIAL THREAT—RUSSIA'S PROGRESS, THE EXTENT OF ITS THREAT, AND WHAT WE MUST DO ABOUT IT

(Dr. Raymond Ewell, vice chancellor of the University of Buffalo, spoke before the Buffalo Business Breakfast Club in Hotel Lafayette on February 18 on the results of his thinking following his recent visit to Russia. His special field of activity at the University is research.)

Most Americans who read newspapers and magazines are now aware (1) that we are engaged in a great struggle with the Soviet Union, (2) that the Soviet Union is growing in industrial and military power, and (3) that our position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union is steadily declining.

However, the vast majority of Americans, at least 99.9 percent, still do not fully realize—

1. That the United States is in by far the greatest peril of its history.

2. That the Communist leaders of Russia really are planning to dominate the whole world, including the United States.

3. That the struggle in which we are now engaged is the climatic struggle of history, which will decide the history of the world for the next few hundred years.

4. That we are up against a completely new social and political force in the world which did not exist 42 years ago,

5. That the Communist threat will probably be the dominant factor in shaping all our lives during the next decade,

6. That this struggle will come to a climax probably in 10 to 15 years,

7. That we are in real danger of losing this struggle,

8. That we have only a few more years of grace before we must gird our loins and begin to fight in earnest.

These are strong statements. But the fact is it is impossible to realize these things unless a person has actually been to Russia. No matter how well-informed a person may be, how many lectures he hears, how many books he reads, it is impossible to understand the Russian situation unless he has actually been to Russia within the past few years. The only way to understand the Russian picture is to go to Russia and feel the throbbing power of that country, see their schools and factories, and above all observe the dynamic character of the Russian people.

The industrial growth of the Soviet Union during the 30 years since they started their first 5-Year Plan in 1928 has been the greatest industrial development of any country in a like period of time. They have advanced from sixth place in industrial output among the countries of the world in 1928 to third place in 1937 and to second place in 1945. From 1928 to 1958, their overall industrial output increased by 28 times. For example, steel production increased from 4.7 million tons in 1928 to 60 million tons in 1958, electric power from 5 billion to 233 billion kilowatts-hours, coal from 39 million to 546 million tons, cement from 11 million to 195 million barrels, tractors from 1,300 to 220,000.

Today, the largest steel mills and the largest electric powerplants in the world are in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is now outproducing the United States in coal, machine tools, railway equipment, timber, iron ore, aluminum ore, nickel, tin, manganese, wool, milk, butter, and sugar. In 3 or 4 years they will be outproducing us in meat, cement, fertilizers, and some other basic products. Their new 7-year plan, which started January 1959 and runs through 1965 calls for 80 percent increase in overall industrial production, for example increasing steel production to 95 million tons, electric power to 500 billion kilowatt-hours, and cement to 440 million barrels.

These are tremendous accomplishments. However, this development would pose no particular threat to the United States if it were not for the fact that this enormous power is in the control of a highly organized ruling class, namely the Communist Party, which is dedicated to the idea of world domination. This is a religious motivation and to be realistic we must look upon communism as a militant religion with all the powerful driving forces which have always been associated with militant religions in history. If it were Switzerland or India or Brazil which was developing this great industrial potential, we would have little cause to be concerned—in fact, we would applaud it as a useful contribution to the world's productive capacity. But when this great power is in the hands of a militant clique bent on unlimited expansion and world domination, every free nation in the world, including the United States, is in peril. As long as the religious fervor of the Communist leaders continues, we will be in great danger, probably increasing from year to year. We cannot count on this religious fervor subsiding for at least a generation and the climax of this struggle seems likely to come before then—probably within 15 years.

Despite the great industrial development in the Soviet Union, its industrial capacity today is still only about 50 percent of the United States. However, its industry has been growing at 10 percent to 15 percent per year since 1945 and appears likely to grow at 7 percent to 9 percent per year during the next 7 years. By comparison, our industrial capacity has been growing at only about 3 percent per year and appears likely to continue at about this same rate. In 1950, the total industrial capacity of the Soviet Union was 25 to 30 percent of that of the United States. In 1958 it had increased to about 50 percent, in 1965 it seems likely to approach 75 percent. In my opinion, this will be a critical point. The Soviets will probably be on a par with the United States in the capacity to carry on a struggle—either a military struggle or an economic struggle—when they have reached about 75 percent of our industrial capacity. The basic reason for this is that Russia is a nonluxury civilization. The 20 to 25 percent of our industrial output which we now put into luxuries is one of our weaknesses in this struggle. The Russians have few luxuries and aren't likely to have many even by 1965. Therefore, they are able to carry on a struggle with less total industrial capacity than we are.

The industrial development of the Soviet Union represents a danger to the United States for three principal reasons:

1. The Soviet Union's industrial development is the basis of their military power.

2. The Soviet Union appears certain to enter the field of international trade as a strong competitor.

3. Greater international trade by the Soviets will inevitably lead to increasing political and cultural ties with many countries, which in turn may lead to political control.

We can expect the Soviets to challenge us with increasing frequency and increasing severity as their industrial power increases. They know that their industrial power at present is not enough to challenge the United States in earnest. They are now playing a cat and mouse game in the Middle East, Formosa, Berlin, etc. These are purely probing operations to see how far we will go. But during the next decade as their industrial power with respect to the United States steadily increases, their challenges will become more and more severe, more and more in earnest. We will need the very highest quality of leadership to deal with these challenges which seem sure to come. The way things appear to be developing now I would expect the real danger to come in the period from 1965 to 1970, for that appears to be the time when their industrial capacity will approach 75 percent of ours. Despite all the talk about missiles, atomic bombs, and nuclear submarines, the real danger lies in the growth of their industrial power.

We have only a few more years of grace, only a few more years of taking life easy, only a few more years of business as usual. Then we will have to gird our loins, jettison many of our luxuries, and get ready to combat the Russian menace in earnest. Our opponent has been on a war basis for 30 years, and we will have to get on a war basis, too, if we want to survive.

The Soviet potential in the field of international trade intensifies this picture. The Soviets have only become active in international trade during the past year or two, except within the Communist group of countries. Heretofore they have not had any surplus of goods they were willing to divert to international trade. Now they have some, and they will have more during the next few years. This may develop very rapidly. For example, in 1958 the Soviet Union exported cars and trucks to 38 different countries. They told me in Russia that they expect to export large quantities of all types of manufactured goods during the next 5 to 10 years—automobiles, trucks, railway equipment, machine tools, electrical, radio and television equipment, typewriters, watches, cameras, chemicals, textiles, etc. The Soviets are in a good position to do this for they can produce goods more cheaply than we can and they are perfectly capable of meeting any quality standards which may be needed. They have a large, intelligent labor force, the best natural resources in the world, modern industrial plants and technology, plenty of well-trained engineers, and most important of all, a low wage scale. They can probably produce nearly any product at a much lower cost than the United States or any country of Western Europe. At the very least, this development could seriously cut into our present international trade. And we must realize that the Soviet Union is likely to be by far the toughest competitor we have ever come up against in international trade.

In addition to their strong position costwise, the Soviets will have the advantage of a political motivation in their international trade program. They can be expected to enter into international trade with the intention of making a profit whenever possible. This should be quite possible with their low cost position. And they can be expected to do this vigorously and aggressively. However, if they can't make a profit, they will enter into international trade deals anyway for political reasons. In other words, international trade is an instrument of national policy with the Soviets, whereas American industry is just not geared to doing business on a nonprofit basis for political reasons.

It would be my guess that the long-range strategy of the Soviets is to expand their international trade steadily with one country after another, offering as good terms as they have to to get the business. Then will come Soviet businessmen, advisers and technicians by the thousands, as I observed them in India. Closer economic ties lead to closer cultural and political ties. Through this process Russia hopes to wean one country after another to their side, or at least convince them they should be neutral. By this process they might in 10 to 15 years get most of Asia and Africa on their side. In South America, too, the Russians are actively making business deals and the neutralization of South America is not beyond the realm of possibility. If these developments were to materialize, Europe would be effectively neutralized, leaving the United States and Canada back to back as the last stronghold of freedom.

What can be done to counteract this grim picture? First and foremost, we need to develop a national purpose, to decide what we stand for in the world and get out and sell this aggressively to the rest of the world. Second, we need to develop a positive, dynamic, long-range foreign policy to replace the passive, defensive, day-to-day foreign policy we have had since 1945. This will probably mean a greatly expanded foreign aid program, even if it hurts. Third, we should accelerate our military preparedness, even if it hurts. Fourth, for the longer pull we need to invest more money in education and scientific research, again even if it hurts.

This is the most desperate situation which this country has ever faced, but with realistic thinking, hard work, pulling in the belt, and a resurgence of the pioneer spirit which built this Nation, we can survive with honor and freedom.

NOMINATION OF HON. BROOKS HAYS TO BE MEMBER OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate unanimously approved the nomination of Brooks Hays the day before yesterday as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Senate for this vote of confidence in Mr. Hays.

I think he is admirably qualified for service on the TVA Board. I have come to know him well through the years of our friendship—we have known each other since our school days at the University of Arkansas—and I have great confidence in his ability. He has long been interested in the field of conservation and flood control, and worked diligently while a Member of the House of Representatives to enact legislation on these matters of such vital importance to our country. He will bring to this position a wealth of experience, an intelligence of the job to be done, and the ability to do it.

As my colleagues of the Senate know, Brooks Hays has made many contributions to his State and to his country. I am glad he has been given this opportunity for further service.

ADDRESS BY HON. WALTER S. ROBERTSON AT SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE, VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a remarkably fine speech made by the Honorable Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, at Sweet Briar College on June 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WALTER S. ROBERTSON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FAR EASTERN AFFAIRS, AT SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE, VIRGINIA, JUNE 1, 1959

President Pannell, members of the faculty, graduates of the class of 1959, distinguished guest, ladies, and gentlemen, I was very flattered to receive the invitation to be your commencement speaker today. Sweet Briar is a name to lure all Virginia males whether he be a romantic from a nearby college, an oldster fostering nostalgic memories of his youth and this campus, a fond father of a Sweet Briar product, or just the ordinary run-of-the-mine Virginian who even though he be devoid of Sweet Briar romance, memories or parenthood takes great pride and gratification in the stream of beauty, charm and culture which flows from these walls to the social and intellectual enrichment of his State.

In this mood it may appear somewhat inappropriate for me now to address you on a subject deeply concerned with the hard realities of a world which seems completely removed from this lovely, peaceful scene. I do so only because there is no escaping the necessity of facing up to the world as it is if the values which make such scenes as this possible are to be preserved.

You of the class of 1959 have doubtless sought to appraise what kind of an adult world you are entering today as graduates. It is, then, perhaps appropriate to recall what Charles Dickens, in what is perhaps his most frequently quoted passage, said of a period almost 200 years ago: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness * * *, it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us." It was, he concluded, a period very like the one in which he was then living 100 years later.

In the face of Dickens' assertion that all ages are alike in combining the best good and the worst evil, the brightest promises and the direst threats, and that each age thinks itself unique in such a paradox, one hesitates to claim this character especially for one's own. Yet Dickens himself, as much as anyone, would surely be overawed by the extremity of the alternatives that confront us in the middle of the 20th century. Scientific discovery and invention are continually opening up new possibilities and they are doing so at a rate of progress that is constantly accelerating. Each year we see ever greater possibilities more clearly before us.

On the one hand, we can perceive ahead of us an age of plenty in which poverty and disease will finally have been conquered: we shall have come to control our environment, our horizons shall have been extended deep into the heart of matter and far out into space. On the other hand, we can perceive as an equally plausible possibility the destruction of civilization—conceivably life itself—by atomic devastation and the poisoning of the atmosphere or, if that is avoided,

Calendar No. 429

86TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 434

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY DEPARTMENTS, FISCAL YEAR 1960

JUNE 25, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2280]

The Committee on Armed Services having had under consideration the subject of authorizing construction at military installations report the bill (S. 2280) with the recommendation that it do pass.

EXPLANATION

Senate Report No. 296 which accompanied H.R. 5674 substantially covers the subject matter of this bill. Subsequent to the reporting of H.R. 5674, the committee has given further consideration to a revised plan for continental air defense that was submitted to the committee by the Secretary of Defense on June 12, 1959. This revised plan for continental air defense required modification of the committee action on H.R. 5674. Instead of proposing modification of H.R. 5674 by a committee amendment, the committee has elected to report a new bill incorporating the modified continental air defense recommendations. For details of the bill other than those relating to the modified continental air defense plan, see Senate Report No. 296, 86th Congress, 1st session.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The committee for the past several years has become increasingly concerned over the wasteful overlapping in weapons systems, particularly in the area of antiaircraft missiles. A review of the committee's actions over the past several years reveals that testimony in the spring of 1956, at the time hearings were held in connection with the fiscal year 1957 MCA bill, seems to indicate that the NIKE-AJAX

missile was to be used in connection with the Army's point defense responsibilities, and the TALOS missile was to be a part of the Air Force area defense mission. At that time, the Army-designed NIKE missile was described as the only weapon in our arsenal currently in place and operational, with the capability of reaching altitudes of known existing enemy aircraft. The bill for fiscal year 1957 contained close to $137 million for antiaircraft facilities, most of which was for support of the NIKE project. Although the TALOS was just leaving the experimental stage and was not yet operational, it promised very high performance. Approximately $16.4 million was requested in that bill to establish certain TALOS sites.

The committee delved quite extensively into these two weapons systems in view of the similar utilization of the weapons and conflicting statements concerning their relative merits. The committee believed that the proponents for each system were dedicated and sincerely patriotic individuals whose sole interest was to provide the best possible national defense. It was concluded, however—as set forth in the report on the 1957 bill:

> * * * that both the Army and the Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the antiaircraft and continental air defense fields. While the Air Force views its mission as one of area defense and the Army views it as one of perimeter or point defense, it is clear that definite and urgent need exists for the Department of Defense to quickly and positively clarify the specific responsibility of each service. The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapon systems costing in the multi-billion-dollar range might result, and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from a military standpoint.

The committee then denied the Air Force authorization for the establishment of TALOS sites and called upon the Secretary of Defense to make a determination. In denying the requested authorization the committee in its report stated:

> Approximately $16,250,000 was requested to establish certain TALOS sites. No objection is made to the continued research and development of TALOS, but the committee does not recommend approval of the $16,250,000, or any other authority for land based operational facilities, until the relative merits of both systems have been positively tested and the roles and mission clarified. It is desired that a scientific test be made at the earliest possible moment. It is suggested that an impartial board be established, composed of professionally qualified members who, on an unbiased basis, are competent to evaluate the two systems and produce a definite recommendation consistent with the best interests of the Nation.
>
> The committee does not believe that Congress should be placed in the position of defining roles and missions, even by inference. Understandably, during the years since unification much trial and error could be expected, but it is believed that sufficient time has now elapsed to provide the

necessary experience upon which to predicate positive decisions.

The committee took the action of denying the authorization for TALOS not because it believed TALOS was an ineffective weapon; on the contrary, testimony indicated that it gave promise of being ideally suited for a role in the air defense system. The committee felt then that Congress should not be called upon to make a determination between the relative merits of weapons systems—that this was a responsibility that should be accepted by the Department of Defense.

On November 26, 1956, the Secretary of Defense assigned TALOS to the Department of the Army; and, subsequently, the land based TALOS was discontinued by the Army.

In considering the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1959, the committee found a similar situation apparently existed with regard to NIKE-HERCULES and BOMARC.

In an attempt to force a decision in this regard, the construction authorization for each of two antiaircraft missiles was reduced by 20 percent and the combined remainder of some $183 million was made available for authorization in the system selected by the Secretary of Defense. The committee was desirous that an entire reappraisal be made of the air defense concept—solely in terms of effectiveness and without preference to individual systems or military departments. This action was intended to assure the most defense for the dollar spent. The Senate endorsed the committee's action by approving the bill by an 80 to 0 vote. The desired clear-cut decision was not made.

During the hearings on Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1960, the Secretary of Defense was questioned on this very point. In effect, he testified that the Department of Defense had not reached a decision between the principal air defense systems. He stated frankly that this is one area where the Department had not done very well in making a decision and that he would not be adverse to Congress taking steps to force such a decision in connection with the consideration of the current budget. Indeed, the committee does not intend to imply that the Secretary has been negligent in this regard, but to the contrary, Mr. McElroy is an outstanding administrator and has proven himself many times over in his most difficult position. Needless to say, he must have the support to which he is entitled if he is to accomplish his most formidable task.

In considering the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1960, the committee concluded that the time had come when a decision must be made. The committee is not alone in its concern over the air defense picture. The Ad Hoc Panel for the Evaluation of the Bomarc Weapon System stated: "The panel became alarmed at the multiheaded approach to the defense problem." This panel, headed by Dr. C. C. Furnas, chancellor of the University of Buffalo, was composed of a distinguished group of scientists who are familiar with the problem. It was not only the "multiheaded" approach to the problem that caused the committee concern, but the serious questions of the effectiveness of some weapons against modern bombers; the fear that the weapons themselves might be outmoded before bases previously authorized could be constructed; the dangers attending the storage of atomic warheads in urban areas; and the results

that might be expected by the detonation of these warheads over the defended populated areas.

To effectuate its views, the committee deleted some $17 million of the $22.4 million requested in the bill as new authorization for the expansion of the NIKE-HERCULES system within the continental United States. The committee likewise rescinded authorization previously granted in fiscal year 1959 for the construction of some 50 HERCULES batteries at 25 locations within the United States and 8 batteries in Hawaii.

THE REVISED PLAN

The action of the committee produced some results and the Secretary of Defense did submit for the consideration of the committee a revised plan for the continental air defense. Although the proposed plan leaves much to be desired, it is a step in the right direction and a step that probably would not have been taken except for the insistence of the committee. Briefly this plan, which will save the taxpayer some $1.4 billions over the next few years, provides for a reduction and revision in the planned deployment of both BOMARC and NIKE-HERCULES missile sites, and a revision and strengthening of the electronic ground environment so necessary to the control of the weapons and the air battle.

The BOMARC deployment will be on the perimeter of the east and west coasts and the Canadian border. This deployment is in keeping with the Furnas report referred to earlier. The NIKE defenses will continue to provide for the urban areas now protected, and will be extended to certain carefully selected Strategic Air Command sites. Although it does not affect the military construction authorization bill, the plan further provides for putting more funds, some $137 million, into the NIKE-ZEUS antimissile missile program for engineering development type of work. Although it was not made clear in the minds of the committee members as to the success of this program, there is great hope that a solution to the ballistic missile threat will be found. While the NIKE-ZEUS system at this stage is not ready for production, every possibility must be explored and the committee, therefore, agrees with the intensification of the program and expresses a strong desire that the Department of Defense proceed with all possible haste with the NIKE-ZEUS and all other antimissile missile possibilities.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee feels that the questions it raised in the draft bill originally submitted were abundantly justified by the facts that the revised plan as submitted by the Secretary has brought forth specific revisions in the program originally submitted, which will provide for a better defense at less cost; namely, a saving of $1.4 billion.

In accepting the revised plan and amending the bill accordingly, the committee does so with some deference to the review that was made. However, the committee still has some reservations about the premises and philosophy employed in the plan. For instance, the committee questions whether too much reliance is being placed upon defense as compared to sharpening our offense with modernization of the Army, the fleet, and perhaps more emphasis on manned interceptors.

The committee expects the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to again carefully review the proposed program before construction is begun on new sites. It urges that full consideration be given to all sites originally contained in the program with a view to selecting for deployment only those of the highest military priority. Careful consideration should be given to expediting the BOMARC program in certain selected areas as recommended in the Furnas report. Particular attention should be given to the early completion of BOMARC sites in those localities where NIKE-HERCULES sites are proposed as a stopgap until BOMARC sites can be completed. This may preclude the duplication of these weapons. The Joint Chiefs of Staff should devote additional study to whether it is advisable to equip surface-to-air missiles with atomic warheads in situations where, in times of conflict, detonation over heavily populated areas might reasonably be expected.

The immediate effect of this revised plan on the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1960 is not great, since construction costs are merely the beginning of the huge expenditures necessary to place these defense sites in operation.

The Secretary of Defense requested certain flexibility in utilizing existing authorization substantially to complete the programs outlined. He advised that the adjustments in the amount of some $17 million made by the committee in the NIKE-HERCULES program need not be restored provided the committee's action in rescinding authorization for certain sites authorized last year is withdrawn. The Secretary further indicated that some $29 million in requested authorization may be deleted from title III, the Air Force portion of the bill, to reflect adjustments in the BOMARC and SAGE programs under the revised plan.

The bill, S. 2280, reflects these changes.

It is the committee's view that with technological advances, the intercontinental ballistic missile is increasingly becoming the primary threat to our cities and offensive forces. Nevertheless, it is recognized that the airbreathing threat will be a real one for a considerable period of time and the defense against manned aircraft and airbreathing missiles should be provided in locations and by the type of weapons that offer multipurpose protection of cities, strategic bases, and other vital facilities. The sites for such weapons must be selected on strictly a military priority basis.

Now that the pattern for the continental air defense has been designed, it is the desire of the committee that the Department of Defense proceed with all reasonable speed to place the perimeter defense part of this program in operation at the earliest possible date.

The committee still feels the best defense is a strong, effective offense.

FISCAL DATA

The revised total of the bill is $1,209,971,000. Of this amount, $58,045,000 represents Reserve components construction. The new total reflects adjustments resulting from the revised air defense plan and a few other revisions found desirable subsequent to the committee's reporting H.R. 5674.

○

Calendar No. 429

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2280

[Report No. 434]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 25, 1959

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported the following bill; which was read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,543,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

Columbus General Depot, Ohio: Utilities, $2,783,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilties, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $3,230,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, research development, and test facilities, and utilities, $628,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,541,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $958,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $2,636,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,260,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $620,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $553,000.

Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.

Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $13,194,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259,000.

Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.

Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $81,830,000.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land

acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the

Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.

Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.

Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.

Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.

Ford Ord, California, 500 units.

Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Opera-

tional facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,497,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities, $701,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacolo, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $24,554,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Station)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,851,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,050,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Opera-

tional facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,000,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real Estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Camp Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, admin-

istrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, adminstrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kameohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilties, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $5,400,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

Naval Station, Guatanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $18,495,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of

Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 450 units.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES

(Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istan-

bul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and "$337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs Area, Colorado: Operational facilities and real estate, $10,000,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,234,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $255,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mis-

souri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilites, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,180,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Re-

search, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,000,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $787,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,452,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,980,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $807,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,168,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $20,000,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Supply facilities and ground improvements, $187,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,475,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,071,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilites, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $1,461,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,661,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $712,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,098,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $557,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $2,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $505,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $74,651,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,199,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,778,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Utilities, $106,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $15,160,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, contructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $417,541,000.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including

land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $15,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and commu-

nity facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwaters RAF station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Maldenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, Community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified locations, 1,083 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, 100 units.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 400 units.

Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, 160 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 100 units.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 200 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 400 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 156 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 670 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 520 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 470 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

Loring Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 100 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 530 units.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 820 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 400 units.

Travis Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 200 units.

Schilling Air Force Base, Kansas, 200 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000" respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85–685 is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,-239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $65,900,000; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section

102, $81,830,000; section 103, $10,000,000; or a total of $181,940,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $111,326,000; outside the United States, $34,950,000; section 202, $18,495,000; section 203, $10,000,000; or a total of $174,771,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $286,746,000; outside the United States, $71,759,000; section 302, $417,541,000; section 303, $15,000,000; or a total of $791,046,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary

of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained

in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343) ;

(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 507 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328) ;

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328) ;

(c) the United States Army, Europe in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994) ;

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 944) ;

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994) ;

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal

for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

(i) the authorization for the construction of

medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson, South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326) : *Provided,* That the unit cost per bed does not exceed $16,000.

(j) medical facilities in the amount of $2,667,000 for Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska, that is contained in title III, section 301, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 344) : *Provided,* That this authorization shall expire on January 1, 1961, if not funded prior to that date.

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at

any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622): *Provided,* That not more than five thousand units shall be contracted for under the authority of such section prior to June 30, 1964; and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. The Secretary of a military department may acquire by lease for indefinite periods of time real property in the Ryukyu Islands needed by the United States Gov-

ernment. Rentals for such leases may be paid in advance from appropriations available for operation and maintenance except advance payments for periods in excess of five years which shall be from appropriations available for military construction.

SEC. 410. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air

Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 411. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 412. No money may be appropriated after December 31, 1959, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the design, development, or procurement of any aircraft or missile unless the appropriation of such money has been specifically authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

SEC. 413. Section 109 (a) of Public Law 85–685 (72 Stat. 636, 641) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "However, the Secretary of the Army shall not make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, for sale pursuant to this section, such lands, or interests therein, not exceeding

one hundred and eighteen acres for channel straightening, and four hundred acres for a temporary spoil disposal area for a period of ten years, as the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary for the improvement or maintenance of the Houston Ship Channel Project."

SEC. 414. Section 403 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) On request by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General shall furnish to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, an opinion as to the sufficiency of title to any property on which it is proposed to construct housing, or on which housing has been constructed, under this section. If the opinion of the Attorney General is that the title to any such property is good and sufficient, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to guarantee, or enter into a commitment to guarantee, the mortgagee, under a mortgage on such property which is insured under title VIII of the National Housing Act, against any losses that may thereafter arise from adverse claims to title. None of the proceeds of any mortgage loan hereafter insured under such title VIII shall be used for title search and title insurance costs."

SEC. 415. None of the authority contained in titles I,

II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 416. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78), is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000."

SEC. 417. Section 404(c)(2) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking the first two sentences thereof and substituting the following language: 'In any condemnation proceedings instituted to acquire any such housing, or interest therein, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421). The amount of such

deposit for the purpose of this section shall not in any case be less than an amount equal to the actual cost of the housing (not including the value of any improvements installed or constructed with appropriated funds) as certified by the sponsor or owner of the project to the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to any statute or any regulation issued by the Federal Housing Commissioner, reduced by the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at the time possession is surrendered, but any such deposit shall not include any excess mortgage proceeds or "windfalls," kickbacks and rebates received in connection with the construction of said housing as determined by the Department of Defense, or any other Federal agency. The amount of such deposit in any case where the sponsor or owner has not certified the cost of the project to the Federal Housing Commissioner at the time of the enactment of this Act, shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, in accordance with the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421): *Provided*, That in the event there is withdrawn from the registry of the court by the owner or sponsor a sum of money in excess of the final award of just compensation, this excess shall be repaid to the United States plus a sum equal to 4 per centum per annum on such excess from the time such sum is deposited in the registry of the court: *Provided further*, That any court in which money

is deposited as provided in this section shall require the furnishing of security by the owner to protect the United States from any loss by reason of a final award of just compensation of less than the amount deposited: *And provided further,* That the deposit required to be made by this section shall be without prejudice to any party in the determination of just compensation. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application and subject to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 per centum of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding.'

SEC. 418. The Secretary of Defense shall not later than July 31, 1959, report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives—

(1) the feasibility of expediting the Bomarc program and utilizing its greater potential coverage and economy of operation in lieu of certain proposed Nike-Hercules installations;

(2) the results of a complete review of all previously programed missile sites with assurance that the selection of those sites to be constructed was made strictly on the basis of military priorities;

(3) the opinion of the respective Chiefs of Staff on the authorized program for the defense of Hawaii with their recommendations, if any, for modification

or change in emphasis and corresponding adjustment of such program;

(4) the latest information on the progress of anti-missile programs with recommendations, if any, for expediting them;

(5) the latest opinion of the respective Chiefs of Staff with respect to the nature of any military threat to the security of the United States in the next five years and their judgments as to whether it is best met by continuing military programs as presently authorized, or whether certain changes should be made in that programing.

SEC. 419. Titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Aberdeen, South Dakota: Training facilities, $168,000.

Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.

Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.

Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.

Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.

Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.

Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.

Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.

Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.

Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.

Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.

Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.

Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.

Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.

Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.

East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.

El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.

Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.

Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.

Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.

Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.

Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.

La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.

Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.

Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.

Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.

Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.

Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.

New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.

Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.

Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.

Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.

Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.

Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.

San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.

San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.

San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.

Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.

Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.

Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.

Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.

Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.

Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.

Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.

Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.

San Jose, California: Parking lot and drill grounds, $1.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(ARMORY)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.

Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.

Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities $215,000.

Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.

Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.

Bound Brook, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.

Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.

Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.

Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.

Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.

Coleville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.

Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Elyria, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.

Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.

Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.

Flemington, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.

Freehold, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.

Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.

Hackettstown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.

Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Idaho Falls, Training facilities, $105,000.

Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.

Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.

Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.

Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.

Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.

Newton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.

Norwalk, Ohio: Training facilities, $140,000.

Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.

Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.

Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.

Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.

Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.

Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.

Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.

Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.

Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.

San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.

Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.

Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.

Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.

Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.

Tuckerton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.

Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.

Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.

Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities and operational facilities, $364,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and troop housing, $188,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Bradley Field, Hartford, Connecticut: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $591,000.

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

Gore Field, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance and operational facilities, $665,000.

Gowen Field, Boise, Idaho: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $3,222,000.

Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Ontario Municipal Airport, Ontario, California: Training facilities, $233,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $430,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Tucson Municipal Airport, Tucson, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided,* That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85–685 is amended under

the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 3 of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."

"Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, $300,000."

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."

"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."

"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."

"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000;" and by striking out in clause (2) (b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place thereof "$12,446,000;" and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,402,000".

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes,

as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army Reserve, $20,916,000;

(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,596,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, $15,580,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of

this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1) (a), (1) (b), (2), (3) (a), and (3) (b) of section 504, respectively.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959".

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site

for a United States Army Reserve Center: *Provided,* That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.

SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts except that any moneys received under section 601 (2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged.

Calendar No. 429

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2280

[Report No. 434]

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. STENNIS

JUNE 25, 1959

Read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar

S. 2280

2. TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS. Passed under suspension of the rules H. J. Res. 439, the continuing resolution making temporary appropriations to departments and agencies pending the enactment of the remaining regular appropriation bills (pp. 11204-8). The Senate later passed this measure without amendment (p. 11157). This measure will now be sent to the President.

3. COMMERCE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7349, (H. Rept. 621) (pp. 11256-7, 11259). Conferees were appointed earlier in the day (p. 11195).

4. STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7343 (H. Rept. 620). pp. 11257-8, 11259

5. PERSONNEL; HOLIDAYS. Passed as reported H. R. 5752, to grant Federal employees a legal holiday on Friday for holidays occurring on Saturday (pp. 11208-29). Rejected a motion by Rep. Johansen to recommit the bill to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 11229).

6. CONTRACTS. Received the conference report on H. R. 7086, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 3 years, until June 30, 1962 (H. Rept. 619). pp. 11229-30, 11259

7. PATENTS. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 4059, with amendment, to amend title 28 of the U. S. Code to protect copyrights from Government infringement, and H. R. 2739, to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office on patents. p. D549

8. LANDS. Received from Interior a proposed bill "to donate to certain Indian tribes some submarginal lands of the United States"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 11259

9. PRICES; INFLATION. Rep. Wolf criticized the report of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth as being "replete with cliches and slogans." pp. 11245-6

10. HOUSING LOANS. Rep. Rogers inserted the statement of the President regarding his approval of H. R. 2256, to provide additional funds for direct housing loans to veterans in rural areas. p. 11248

11. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Johnson, Colo., inserted a Library of Congress memorandum, "Rising Interest Rates and the Role of Monetary and Debt-Management Policy." pp. 11252-4

SENATE

12. COTTON. Sen. Johnston urged favorable action by the USDA on a petition submitted to the Secretary by the National Cotton Council "seeking relief for the cotton-growers of America from the growing threat of foreign cotton textile imports," and he stated that "unfair privilege" is given foreign manufacturers who "can purchase American cotton at 6 cents per pound cheaper than American manufacturers." pp. 11160-1

13. MUTUAL SECURITY. Began debate on S. 1451, the mutual security authorization bill for 1959 (pp. 1157-60, 11171-9, 11180-1). Sen. Humphrey announced his intention to propose an amendment to the bill to "correct" the situation whereby certain surplus foods, "butter, for example ... will be offered for sale abroad ... before it is made available as a gift for needy and hungry people in the United States" (pp. 11180-1).

14. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Passed, with amendments, 89 to 3, H.R. 5674 to authorize construction at military installations, including the use of foreign currencies under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing construction. Conferees were appointed. House conferees have not yet been appointed. (pp. 11091-11120, 11121-8, 11141-52, 11155-7).

Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Stennis which he stated "provides for a broadening of Public Law 480, so far as military construction is concerned, by using the proceeds from surplus commodities. Public Law 480 now applies to schoolhouses, farm housing, and items of that nature. This amendment proposes to broaden it whenever it is feasible." (p. 11155).

15. WHEAT. Sen. Fulbright announced that hearings would be held on the Internationa Wheat Agreement, 1959, by the Foreign Relations Committee on July 14 at 10 a.m. p. 11984

16. PRICE SUPPORTS; FORESTRY. Received from the Hawaii Legislature and Governor the following resolutions requesting Congress: (1) to enact legislation to include coffee among the basic agricultural commodities assisted and supported by programs under the AAA of 1938, and to authorize parity payments to coffee growers in Hawaii; (2) to establish and operate a Forest Research Center in Hawaii (p. 11080); (3) to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954, as amended, so that income from the sale of perennial crops may be prorated to the number of years required to cultivate the crops. pp. 11080-1

17. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Yarborough inserted a resolution of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association opposing any attempts to weaken or destroy the preference clause (giving preference to nonprofit and rural electric systems in the use of Federal power). p. 11082

The "Daily Digest" states that the Public Works Committee "in executive session, reconsidered H. R. 3460, to amend the TVA Act so as to assist in the financing of its power programs, and tentatively approved the bill with amendments. The Committee will meet again on Thurs., July 2, to review new language contained in the bill, and the report thereon." p. D547

18. BUDGET; INFLATION. Sens. Aiott and Young, N. D., inserted editorials urging a balanced budget and a curb on inflation. pp. 11128-9

19. FISCAL POLICY; ECONOMIC CONDITIONS. Sens. Proxmire, Kuchel, Clark, Symington, and Bridges debated fiscal policy, the recent Cabinet Committee study on price stability and inflation, and economic conditions. pp. 11084-5, 11086-7, 11089-91.

20. RESEARCH. Sen. Humphrey announced that hearings would be held July 9 and 16 on international medical research by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Government Operations Committee. pp. 11179-80

21. CONSERVATION CORPS. Sen. Humphrey inserted an article by the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO in support of his bill S. 812, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. p. 11181

22. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that the Senate would continue debate on S. 1451, the mutual security authorization bill and expressed hope that action would be concluded on it by Thurs., but, if not, the Senate would meet Fri. p. 11160

to reflect adversely on the integrity of the Michigan Supreme Court, and Justice Edwards, in particular.

Justice Edwards needs no defense before the people of Michigan. They have already displayed their high regard for him, when they elected him to the State supreme court by the highest margin ever given an elected official in Michigan's history.

He needs no defense among his colleagues in the legal world who know of his national reputation for integrity.

But because there are still some who read Time without making the necessary allowances for bias and fiction content, I am taking this opportunity to set the record straight.

So that my colleagues can see the lopsided reporting job done by Time, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article be printed in the RECORD, at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, another interesting example of how the press has treated this issue can be found in the strange case of the Detroit Free Press.

Back in 1954, when the Michigan Employment Security Commission first held against the Michigan Ford workers, the Free Press bemoaned the decision in an editorial entitled "Good Grounds for a Union Appeal." Yet in 1959, following the decision of the State supreme court favorable to the workers, the Free Press completely reversed itself in an editorial entitled "Michigan's Prospects Get a Jarring Blow."

This, it would seem, is a continuation of the "smear Michigan" campaign which the Free Press originally did so much to launch.

EXHIBIT 1

LABOR: MAKING STRIKING CHEAP

"This decision will force an employer, in effect, to finance a strike against himself through providing companywide strike benefits." So said Ford Motor Co.'s Vice President John Bugas, commenting on a Michigan State Supreme Court decision which the U.S. Supreme Court declined to review last week. What the Michigan court decision did was to repeal a longstanding rule that functionally integrated plants are all part of the same establishment. Hereafter, employers may be taxed to pay unemployment compensation even when the union strikes a plant on which the whole company operation depends for an essential part.

The case grew out of a United Auto Workers' strike at Ford's Canton, Ohio, castings plant in 1953. Seeking a reason for reopening a 5-year wage contract, the UAW claimed a safety violation at Canton, then the supplier of all the rear axle shafts used in Ford cars and trucks. The UAW held the unionists out 5 weeks, forcing Ford to shut down across the Nation, grant the union a big pension-fund increase. The Michigan Employment Security Commission ruled that the Michigan workers were involved in the Canton strike and so were ineligible for unemployment pay. A circuit court upheld the commission. But last January the State's highest court reversed the ruling, ordered the commission to pay Ford employees about $1 million in benefits. Author of the majority opinion was Associate Justice George Edwards, 44, onetime UAW employee (director of education and welfare). To the surprise of Michigan lawyers, Edwards did not disqualify himself, although another associate justice, Thomas M. Kavanagh, State attorney general when the case got into court, did.

To Ford and other automakers, the Michigan decision means that thereafter, when the union strikes a key production plant, the employers will have to pay the bulk of the strike benefits, except at the establishment actually on strike. Under the law, each company is liable for benefits paid to its employees. When its balance is drawn down, its payroll taxes go up until the proper reserve is established. In any future strike on the Canton pattern, said a Ford spokesman last week, the company must figure on paying $3, million a week to UAW members on top of the loss of sales.

Again I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota for his courtesy.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the Senator from Nevada, I may yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee and the Military Construction Subcommittee, who have spoken on this measure, for the able presentations they have made.

I, too, support passage of this bill, and I voted for it in committee. But I did so with extreme reluctance and disappointment. I would be less than frank if I did not say that it would be regrettable if this Nation were to expect to find comfort in the revised plan for continental air defense which is a vital part of this bill.

The Senator from Nevada voted for this measure, and supports it now, because it is the only plan. It is the plan which comes closest to the consensus of the Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Pentagon.

As the able Senators from Georgia and Mississippi have said, this committee does not originate military policy. Its function is not to dictate how America is to be defended.

However, the committee has the obligation and the duty to point out the apparent weaknesses in the programs presented to it, and to make recommendations to the military and to the Members of the Senate.

The deficiencies which are pointed out in the committee's latest report are not to be taken lightly.

It has pointed to wasteful overlapping in weapons systems. It points out that "during the years since unification, much trial and error could be expected, but it is believed that sufficient time has now elapsed to provide the necessary experience upon which to predicate positive decisions." Our insistence on positive decisions is of utmost importance. It is a sad and tragic thing for the committee to be asked by the experts to make determinations between the relative merits of one system of weapons over another. Yet, the Secretary of Defense asked that the subcommittee hold his feet to the fire because the services and his subordinates were unable to agree.

As a result of prior Senate support, Mr. President, the committee was recently given a so-called revised master plan for continental air defense. While it is an improvement, and will provide for a slightly improved defense, at an estimated savings to the taxpayers of $1.4 billion it is not, in my opinion, satisfactory; it is not a report from which the American people can draw confidence. Like a political speech at election time, it contains something for everybody—only, instead of serving the security of the country, it appears to me that it serves the rivaling services. It has something for the Army's Nike-Hercules system, and something for Air Force Bomarc. It even has something for one admiral's position, which is to go slowly or eliminate both of these systems. But the master plan refuses to come to grips with the real need—namely, to make a definite decision, and to meet squarely the missile challenge from enemies of the free world.

The whole program is a calculated risk. I hope the Senate will never again be asked to support so great a risk—a risk so shaky that even out top military leaders have to apologize for it, and scarcely are able to defend or demonstrate a reassuring faith in their own basic decisions.

Still, it was not a unanimous opinion, because the Joint Chiefs of Staff could not agree. So the Secretary of Defense was forced to make the decision.

We are told by the military, Mr. President, even by the Commander in Chief, that our best defense is a good offense. But the so-called master plan is primarily defensive. It is based on the concept that we should make it more costly for any enemy to contemplate an attack on this country. So, in effect, the administration would have us raise the price which must be paid by any aggressor. This is well and good; but it painfully neglects conviction in the concept that any attacker, while destroying this country, would himself be destroyed. This concept, after all, is the only real deterrent between the free world and the slave world.

Without the clear potential of being able to destroy an enemy in a retaliatory blow, the United States is vulnerable to

attack from bombers, from missiles, and from submarines, and may indeed be inviting it from an overly ambitious, overly confident aggressor. I view the current direction of our military decisions as too much concerned with what the enemy might do, and too little concerned with supporting a military establishment which would make such an attack suicidal from the viewpoint of any nation contemplating warfare. It is a plan growing out of the concept of purely defensive warfare which pays little more than lipservice to offense. It is a plan upon which nations older than ours have fallen.

We have spent tens of billions of dollars on defense in this decade, and now we are confronted with an army that is not modernized and a military establishment of dubious power when evaluated for practicality in the age of missile warfare which we are entering.

One year we expend the taxpayers' dollars on a costly system designed to protect the industrial centers and cities of large populations. Next year, we practically have the open admission that all of this is wrong—that the defensive emphasis should be placed on defending military bases in order to protect our retaliatory positions. Members of the committee have asked, why is it that now we are finally getting around to defending our retaliatory system? Why wasn't it done before? The answers have not been given. We are told that our leaders know what they are doing, and that therefore, we should believe, and should not question.

Seven years ago, an overwhelming majority of the people of this country voted for a great military hero and leader of our forces in World War II. They felt—with some justification—that they would be safer, that this country could rest easier in a time of international peril with a military hero at the helm. Yet rivalry among the services has never been greater because of the absence of affirmative leadership on the part of the President as Commander in Chief.

Mr. President, I suggest that not only has the tension between the services increased, but so has also the general insecurity of the public in the capability of this country to withstand attack.

Until the President resolves the problem of interservice rivalry, there will be justification for questioning the decisions of the military. These vital military decisions cannot be made by the members of this subcommittee.

There is one further comment I would make on this portion of the military authorization bill. It is the observation that while we are preparing for a period during which we hope to close the missile gap, I do not believe that we have gone far enough in filling this void with a sufficiently powerful system of manned interceptors to cover the interim period between now and the time when the ballistic missile threat becomes the all-consuming reality. And, in my opinion, this bill, with all of its faults, will serve a good purpose if it can make clear our demand that the military be forced to agree on an adequate system of offensive missile power.

The administration can accomplish this, as the committee suggests, by constant review of the program.

Until we can perfect our intercontinental ballistic missiles as an immediate and overdue offensive deterrent, all that we can do is hope against hope that the Russians are having as many ICBM misfires as we are encountering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, an editorial entitled "Air Defense Plan," which was published in the Washington Star of June 25.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR DEFENSE PLAN

It is not difficult to understand the reluctance with which a Senate Armed Services Subcommittee has approved the Defense Department's master plan for air defense. The Senators were reluctant because, despite their misgivings, they were not technically qualified to pass judgment on the details of the air defense plan. And this, needless to say, goes double for armchair strategists whose information in this area is much more limited than that of the Senators.

Generally speaking, however, the misgivings grow out of a suspicion that we may be betting too heavily on the wrong horse. We may be investing too much money and effort in the Army's Nike-Hercules and the Air Force's Bomarc, which are designed for defense against manned bombers, and not enough in missiles designed for defense against other missiles. At the moment, it is believed, any significant Russian attack on the United States would have to be made with bombers, and this is a possibility which cannot be, and has not been, ignored. The picture is changing, however, and within a few years the Soviets' ICBM's, not their bombers, will pose the real threat. When that time comes, the anxious Senators do not want this country to be long on bomber defense and short on missile defense. Therefore, the subcommittee is going along with the master plan, which provides for cutbacks in both the Nike-Hercules and Bomarc programs, and gives some extra push to the Nike-Zeus, which is being brought along as an antimissile missile.

Senator STENNIS, the subcommittee chairman, made two points, however, which deserve attention. First, he said that his group continues to believe strongly in the deterrent influence of offensive striking power—in other words, our capacity to hit back will continue to be our first and best line of defense. Second, he urged that we should proceed speedily with all antimissile research and programs.

The significance of this is that some qualified people doubt that the Nike-Zeus, even when perfected, will provide an effective defense against incoming ICBM's. They think a more advanced and more sophisticated weapon will be needed. And if they are correct it would be a grave mistake to lull the country into believing that development of the Nike-Zeus will enable us to sleep comfortably at night in the years to come. It may just be a first step in missile defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] on the able presentation he has just now concluded on the floor.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, today a great man leaves the service of his country.

The retirement of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, of Missouri, brings to a close a distinguished military career.

Few men in our history have served so well in such a variety of military responsibilities.

An idea of the range of his talents and his service comes from recalling some of the career of the retiring Chief of Staff of the Army.

Max Taylor is a great student. He is a great linguist. He led the airborne attack in the early hours of D-day. His reconnaissance mission behind the lines into Rome during 1943 is legendary.

He became the first postwar commandant of West Point, and brought the curriculum at the Military Academy in line with the demands of modern soldiering.

General Taylor commanded our armies in Korea.

Every job he has done has been performed in the highest traditions of the military service.

Despite the energetic efforts of such dedicated officers as General Taylor, the U.S. Army has not been permitted to keep pace with the changes necessary to keep our relatively very small Army either modern or mobile.

It is no secret—as General Taylor himself said the other day, before the National Press Club—that he is retiring with a complete sense of frustration, as a result of the sad condition of the American army—a condition for which the Congress shares responsibility with the executive branch.

Mr. President, I now turn to a subject even more directly related to the defense bill before the Senate.

UNBALANCED FORCES

It is not clear to me why the administration's so-called master plan for our continental defense has received favorable consideration. That statement on my part is no reflection on anyone. I realize the difficult task the committee had; but it is hard for me to understand why we vote for something we do not approve.

As I have previously stated, there would appear to be three primary requisites for our national security: First, after a possible attack, this country must have the strength to get up off the ground and, in turn, destroy the aggressor; second, there must be prior knowledge on the part of any would-be aggressor that we have that strength, and would use it. No one ever started a war which he did not expect to win. Finally, in order to protect this country and fulfill our worldwide commitments, we must have the capacity to wage effectively so-called limited war.

Today, the first of these three points depends almost entirely upon the modernity and effectiveness of the planes of the Strategic Air Command. Tomorrow, it will depend increasingly upon long-range missiles, augmented by such new and promising delivery systems as the Polaris submarine system.

Despite the lack of progress in the current diplomatic negotiations looking toward peace, we nevertheless are now asked to approve a program which means we would plan to continue to drag our feet in modernizing what everybody, from the President down, asserts is the chief deterrent—SAC.

And, although our gross national product is now running at a rate of some billion and a quarter dollars a day, we attempt to justify this policy on the grounds we cannot afford to do more.

At the same time we know that today we do not have adequate capacity to handle our worldwide commitments in any extended limited conflict.

Those of us who have studied the matter also know that our relatively very small ground combat forces, Army and Marines, which face the Communists in such places as Germany and Korea, are outmanned, outgunned, and out-tanked.

Most of the ground equipment which these forces have has not been modernized since World War II.

The Soviets, on the other hand, have completely modernized their divisions since World War II—in some instances twice over.

The Congress is now being asked to approve a program which, in theory, might give some protection against enemy bombers here at home. As they weigh the manner in which our wealth is being allocated, the people should know the very low number of long-range Soviet bombers we now estimate the Russians have.

At the same time the administration continues to refuse to recommend any plan for adequate modernization of our ground combat strength.

Because of their realism, and their rapid progress, the Soviets will be less likely to originate a nuclear war than they will be to continue to promote local conflicts all around the world.

It is natural for people to want to look after their own skins.

But I do not believe that, practically speaking, these billions now going into ground-to-air defense can be justified from the standpoint of protecting anybody's skin; because these defenses are either already obsolete, or will be obsolete by the time they are operational in any quantity.

All this so-called master plan really does, therefore, is give the same false sense of security once given to free people by the Maginot line.

Why do we condone spending billions for an unsound defense, at the same time we refuse to spend less than one-half of the one day's national income of this country to modernize our relatively very small ground forces?

This plan, at best, represents but further compromise between the warring services; and forces the taxpayer to continue to waste billions of dollars on an unsound defense.

I would hope that in the future the Senate recommends this money be expended to obtain those previously referred to minimum requirements necessary for our national security.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent that a column of Walter Lippmann's of June 25, "Debate on Defense," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBATE ON DEFENSE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Last week the Democratic Advisory Council issued a long pamphlet dealing with national defense. The worst thing that can be said about it is that it is sponsored by a political party, or rather by a faction of a political party, and that it will, therefore, be heavily discounted. This is a pity. For, disregarding a few unnecessary and extraneous partisan phrases, the pamphlet deserves a very careful reading.

There is a large literature already existing which is critical of our defense policy. Having read a good deal of it, I would venture to say that this pamphlet is much the best in its field, evidently quite expertly informed, reasonable and civilian in its temper, and lucidly written.

It ought not to be brushed aside as a partisan document. For, in fact, the argument it makes has the support of large numbers of Republicans, especially of those who have paid close attention to the problem of defense, and of many of the military men who by common consent are leaders in military thought. Moreover, the pamphlet is not a Democratic Party document since there is no reason to think that the present Democratic leadership in Congress agrees with it.

The two main points of the pamphlet are familiar enough. The first one deals with the missile gap which, on the admission of Secretary McElroy is likely to bring it about that in the next 3 years the U.S.S.R. will have in intercontinental ballistic missiles a supremacy of 3 to 1. This could mean that during these years the U.S.S.R. would be theoretically capable of knocking out the bulk of our Strategic Air Force. The pamphlet does not say that the U.S.S.R. would, or is likely to, try for such a Pearl Harbor. But it is right in saying that the existence of this theoretical power would have an important effect on the political relations between the West and the Communist powers.

The other point, which is also familiar, is that defense cannot be allowed to depend solely on nuclear weapons—the big ones which are suicidal or the small ones which would be devastating to our allies and to the uncommitted countries.

The pamphlet contains a carefully reasoned and persuasive argument why expenditures should be increased to close the missile gap and to increase our conventional forces.

What interested me most in the pamphlet, given the fact that it was written under the auspices of Mr. Dean Acheson, was the illuminating candor with which it explains how things have changed since the Truman administration. The critical change is this: Our original strategy in NATO was based on our possession at the time of a monopoly of nuclear weapons. Under those conditions, a small ground force, backed by the irresistable power of the Strategic Air Force, was quite sufficient to hold in check the enormously superior masses of the Red army.

Our monopoly was broken by the Soviets in 1949, and this has brought with it, as the U.S.S.A. developed its bombs and its missiles, a radical change in the balance of power. We are far from being defenseless against this new might of the Soviet Union. But there is no doubt that our allies in Western Europe and our client states in Asia are far more vulnerable than they were 10 years ago. This could have serious political consequences, if the missile gap is allowed to become so wide that this country, which is the ultimate protector of the non-Communist world, becomes itself highly vlnerable.

No matter what it costs, this must not be allowed to happen.

It would be a very useful thing if the administration issued a thoroughgoing, fully considered reply. This would not be easy to do, because within the Pentagon and within the administration itself there are so many who agree with the pamphlet. But it would be a true public service if the President, who does not agree, would see to it that there is a reply.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senate will have another opportunity to evaluate this situation when the fiscal year 1960 defense appropriation bill comes to the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CLARK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to compliment my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Missouri for again calling to the attention of the Senate the great urgency and need for a balanced national defense. I should also like to join in the well-deserved tribute he has paid to Gen. Maxwell Taylor. Certainly, the retirement of Gen. Maxwell Taylor on July 1 will, I feel, mark the premature end of one of our great soldier-statesmen.

In his retirement from active duty, I feel America will indeed be the great loser. I feel, with respect to a system of defense in which there is an adequate ground force to hold the line against Communist aggression short of nuclear warfare, Gen. Maxwell Taylor was perhaps the most able of any of the men I have seen in the Department of Defense since the great Gen. George C. Marshall left that office.

Certainly we all regret that General Taylor will not longer be able to make his voice heard in urging such matters as a modern airlift capability and lightweight equipment for a mobile striking force of adequate capacity. Certainly we shall miss his able, competent, and sincere voice in an effort to bring about a well-rounded system of weapons and of national defense.

I am happy to join my distinguished friend and colleague in the position which he has stated to the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Oklahoma for his kind remarks with respect to this great general who is retiring today.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 26, which the able Senator from Nevada has thoughtfully handed to me. The article is entitled "Taylor Asks Revamping of Military."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAYLOR ASKS REVAMPING OF MILITARY—CHIEF OF STAFF WOULD RESHUFFLE SEPARATE SERVICES

(By John G. Norris)

Retiring Army Chief of Staff Maxwell D. Taylor, in a parting broadside at the Penta-

gon setup, called yesterday for a complete reappraisal of American military strategic objectives and a revamping of forces to meet changed world conditions.

In a farewell speech at the National Press Club, General Taylor said these changes have made invalid the Nation's reliance on massive retaliation as the keystone of its strategy.

He indicated that his limited success in modernizing the Army was one reason for his retirement.

He gave President Eisenhower some advice on what he had in mind to bring peace at the Pentagon by telling the parable of the unhappy mess sergeant. In it, a company commander—obviously the President—improved the bad food in his mess by taking personal charge and setting his inexperienced mess sergeant—Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy—straight.

Taylor said that after a thorough review of national aims, the Nation should determine the kind of military forces it needs and set yardsticks of sufficiency for them by functional categories.

Funds then should be divided by functional forces, consisting of strategic retaliation, continental air defense, limited war, and antisubmarine commands, rather than allotted to the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

To illustrate what should be done, Taylor told of the company commander who cured what was wrong with his mess by stepping in personally instead of calling for outside experts. He said he found that his new mess sergeant was relying on his four stubborn cooks, none of whom was boss. Two were specialists in airy souffles, another a seafood expert, and the fourth a meat and potatoes man.

They never could agree on the next day's menu, and gave the mess sergeant separate shopping lists each morning as he went to market. The latter did his best, listening to vendors hawking their wares, spending his his money, but never coming back with enough food to provide three square meals for the troops.

The captain solved the problem by ordering menus prepared a week in advance, subject to his approval, and limited buying to what was on the menu.

He ordered the cooks to get together, prepare the dishes they could do best, and make the right chow out of it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would point out to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who is one of the authorities in this body on military matters, that those soldiers who protest the lack of modernity and mobility in the Army are generally out of the Army in a fairly short time. Such outstanding officers as General Van Fleet, General Ridgway, General Gavin, and now General Taylor come to mind.

It is my recollection the Army took 80 percent of the casualities in Korea and that the Marine Corps took 18 percent of the casualties. These statistics reveal with stark realism the burden carried by our ground forces.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I join my friend from Oklahoma in complimenting the Senator from Missouri for his very forthright address, which I hope will receive far more attention across the country and in this body than I am afraid it will. I should like also, if I may, and I am sure the Senator from Missouri will join with me, to compliment our distinguished new colleague from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for the perfectly splendid address he made, indicating his grasp of a very technical matter and his interest in the defense of our country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to join the Senator in his appropriate reference to the statement by the Senator from Nevada. In fact, I expressed myself reviously on that matter and am pleased that the Senator from Pennsylvania has further emphasized it.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy the Senator has done so.

As I turn to the remarks of the Senator from Missouri, which he was kind enough to furnish me in advance, I notice that he believes that the primary prerequisite for our national security is that, first, after an attack, this country must have the strength to get off the ground and in turn destroy the aggressor. I fear we may not have that strength now, and if matters continue as they are now for a couple of years more, we will not have that strength. Would the Senator from Missouri mind commenting on that observation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. In my opinion, we do have that strength now; but unless we radically change now our present plans and policies we will not have sufficient strength within 2 or 3 years.

I recall that on January 23 of this year I corrected the Secretary of Defense, who had said the day before that we would have the Atlas ICBM ready for combat by June 30 of this year. He had previously said we would have the Atlas operational even earlier than June 30. I had corrected him then also. Such optimistic misinformation gives the American people a false sense of security. Just this last Saturday, in a press conference at Quantico, the Secretary said that probably within 2 months we would be operational in ICBM's. Again I say that is not correct. More care should be given by high officials to the accuracy of what they say to the American people with respect to our national defense.

Mr. CLARK. Is my friend of the view that we need something approaching a crash program to bring our intercontinental ballistic missile and intermediate range ballistic missile units into far quicker utilization than is presently contemplated?

Mr. SYMINGTON. In my prior remarks I stated that what the Russians really fear today is the Strategic Air Force. Although the testimony is that over 75 percent of the bombers in SAC are obsolescent and becoming obsolete, the administration's plan is to correct that growing obsolescence by replacing only about 5 percent of those planes over the next few years.

So far as the intercontinental ballistic missiles are concerned, we could double the scheduled production of these missiles with the existing plant facilities and organization.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is well informed with respect to our strategic necessities. Does the Senator not believe as a matter of national security it would be a wise step to take to double our existing missile production?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that the Russians are deterred from attacking us today because of our Strategic Air Force. This deterrence will continue to exist only if we produce quickly and in sufficient quantities the intercontinental ballistic missiles and the Polaris submarines.

Mr. CLARK. I do not want to press my friend too far or to ask him to answer questions which he thinks it would be wiser not to answer. Perhaps I am mistaken, and that is why I ask the Senator's opinion.

Is it not true, with respect to the production of ballistic missiles, both intercontinental and intermediate range, that our present rate of progress is unsatisfactory in the light of the obsolescence of the Strategic Air Force, which we now know is going forward?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree. I think the more Atlases, the more Titans, the more Minutemans, and the more Polarises we build and disperse, the greater will be the security of the United States.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator feel that the authorization for the missile program which has been reported from the Armed Services Committee is adequate?

Mr. SYMINGTON. When one talks about missiles, I will say to the able Senator from Pennsylvania, it is a question of the type and capability of the missile, a question of dispersion of the missile, and a question of hardening of the missile bases. My view of the proposed authorization has been made clear. We are stressing defense at the expense of needed offense.

An excellent article written by Edward Hymoff appeared in the June 25 issue of Reporter magazine. It gives the truth in detail for the first time. I ask unanimous consent that this article appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME OF OUR LAUNCHING PADS ARE MISSING

(By Edward Hymoff)

Last January, when the missile experts in and around Vandenberg Air Base in California read that Defense Secretary Neil McElroy had stated that the first squadron of 10 Atlas ICBM's would be on station and ready for use by mid-July, there were many derisive references to McElroy's "magic wand." The derision did not abate when McElroy quickly corrected the error and shifted the deadline to the end of the year or when the President, in his TV report to the Nation on March 16, appeared to support his Defense Secretary's corrected deadline by indicating that Atlas ICBM's would be generally available in 1959.

The simple truth of the matter—if anything at all in the missile business can be considered simple—is that if all goes well, we shall have the means to fire in anger only three Atlas missiles by midsummer this year. Early next year we shall have a second launching complex capable of firing three more Atlases, which will still leave us four short of the promised full squadron. The rest will come later, and most of it a good deal later—and therein lies the story of one aspect of the missile lag that has not been fully reported or understood.

The public announcements from Washington are almost exclusively preoccupied with the production and testing of the "birds" themselves. But missiles are very

much like bullets: without a gun—which is to say an operational launching site—they are absolutely useless. And like a quality gun, a launching complex requires painstaking design, individual machining in construction, and precise testing. Today it is far easier, quicker, and cheaper to build the missiles than to build the bases that will launch them.

GETTING TO FIRST BASE

One man who understands thoroughly this unpublicized area of the missile lag is Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, former chief of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division and now head of that service's Air Research and Development Command. At Senate hearings early this year he skirted the subject briefly. Preparedness for missile warfare, he testified, includes "base construction, it means training, it means the setting up of new units." Moreover, he added, "we are introducing this type of weapon for the first time in the history of this country, and it requires an entirely new operational environment * * *.

"Money isn't everything," General Schriever repeated for my benefit in the quiet of his office. "Even with money, time problems can't be compressed. This is what we have to consider when we transform technology into a missile weapons system. In this relatively new technology we often require lead times in excess of 2 years—sometimes even 3 years."

Setting aside the intermediate-range ballistic missiles, effective against the Soviets only from overseas bases, we are relying for missile retaliation on a hard core of three ICBM weapons systems: the Atlas, the Titan, and the Minuteman, and on the intermediate-range Polaris, which when mounted on nuclear submarines will have an effective range equal to the ICBM's. The Atlas has been tested successfully but after five consecutive flight failures is still far from achieving the 80 percent operational reliability Air Force missile experts hope to attain. The Titan is now undergoing basic flight tests and is at least a year to 18 months behind the Atlas in its operational schedule. Minuteman, a less expensive solid-fuel long-range weapon, is 4 to 6 years in the future, while the solid-fuel Polaris is at least 2 years from installation in submarines capable of underwater launchings.

The first step in getting the ICBM's off the ground is the creation of a missile base. Today Vandenberg Air Force Base, spread over 65,000 acres of wasteland some 175 miles northwest of Los Angeles, is the only one in existence—and it is far from completion. (Cape Canaveral, so often in the headlines, is a launching base for test and research missiles only.) Vandenberg though designed primarily for training purposes, could be used as an operational base. Work on this site is now going into high gear, with double shifts and overtime. Construction workers have begun excavating deep holes and tunnels that will become part of the most expensive diggings in the Western World.

These excavations will ultimately house four underground silos for the mighty Titan. According to top Air Force officials, there will also be two Atlas launching complexes each of which will consist of three launching pads accommodating the same number of missiles. (Eight additional launching pads at Vandenberg, of which four are now completed, will be used for the training of missilemen for the intermediate-range Thor and the launching of modified Thors used in the current Discoverer satellite program.) When this huge integrated complex is finally completed in late 1961, it will provide the capability of one 10-missile ICBM squadron—though of mixed breed—which Secretary McElroy promised for the end of 1959.

LONG AND SHORT OF HARD AND SOFT

Three major steps are required to bring a launching complex to a state of operational readiness: Design, construction, and checking. The design phase covers a period of engineering conferences to establish what the launching complex will look like and to iron out the many problems posed by the geography and geology peculiar to each site. As General Schriever put it to me, each complex must be "tailor made for the base where you're going to locate the missiles." The design phase alone, he pointed out, "runs from 5 to 6 months" before the construction contracts are even let.

The construction phase which follows may run from 15 to 20 months. It will have taken 20 months, for instance, to build Vandenberg's first launching complex.

The final phase—what General Schriever calls the installation and checkout of the supporting equipment that makes a missile "truly operational"—takes about 9 months. In all, then, 30 to 35 months is required to bring these intricate launching bases to complete readiness.

There is little chance of this leadtime being cut back. The Atlas was originally designed in 1954 as a "soft" weapon standing above ground in a vertical position. The radio guidance system then in use required ground antennas about a mile downleg to keep the bird on course as it slowly climbed into the sky. However, as a result of subsequent breakthroughs in inertial guidance systems which have made it possible to fire the Atlas from underground or "hard" sites, all but the first three bases will be semihard or hard—and hard sites take about 10 months longer to build than soft sites. The Titan, of course, has been planned from conception as an underground-based missile. The Minuteman is expected to be emplaced in both mobile (railroad flatcar) soft sites and in stationary hard sites.

Hard and soft sites have been the subject of a heated debate between their respective proponents. Many top-ranking officers in the Air Force have lobbied for the hard sites with colorful and often dramatic presentations based upon what they consider valid intelligence. Our missiles, they say, will some day be accurate enough to hit a hundred-foot-diameter bull's-eye. "And if they're going to be this accurate," a Strategic Air Command officer warned, "it stands to reason that the Soviets will reach this degree of effectiveness with their missiles."

One prominent civilian missile engineer, with considerable experience in the nuclear-weapons field, disagreed. "An Atlas site above ground but built in a narrow ravine or canyon has greater protection than an underground site," he told me. "Let's face it: we can build a hell of a lot of soft sites in canyons and ravines much faster, put the birds on them, and have our deterrent and retaliatory power at least 2 years earlier than present construction schedules call for."

He acknowledges that a direct hit will naturally knock out a soft surface installation, "but experience in nuclear tests has shown us that a near miss on the other side of a hill or mountain will barely shake up a soft site." Describing his own studies of the blast effects of air, surface, and underground nuclear test explosions, he told me that a near miss at a hard underground site can do far greater damage. "It's like an earthquake," he explained. "Underground communications and control cables can be knocked haywire—and remember, some of the most sensitive equipment ever devised is a part of a missile's ground installation."

He conceded, however, that the monumental cost of building what General Schriever calls "an entirely new operational environment" can be cut down by emplacing ICBM's in many of the hundreds of abandoned mines spotted throughout the Nation: "There's no reason at all why some of these mines can't be converted," he said. "The Army Corps of Engineers has presented studies of the feasibility of utilizing abandoned mines, but they've been turned down cold by the Air Force. And the Corps of Engineers has been in the construction business longer than the Air Force has been in existence."

The Air Force refused to comment beyond a brief statement that the decision to table the study "is not completely correct." Subsequent investigation indicates that abandoned mine sites will probably be used for future generations of missiles like the solid-fuel Minuteman of 1963–65.

At present the only completely hardened site under construction is Vandenberg's first Titan complex. A giant silo, 155 feet deep and 40 feet wide, is well under way and will take a total of 2 years to build. When finished, it will be covered by massive steel and concrete doors that will automatically open to permit the huge 110-ton bullet-shaped missile to rise to ground level on an elevator.

Trained manpower is one of the biggest problems facing the Air Force today and contributes measurably to the over-all time lag of our missile program. As of now, an Atlas squadron calls for 550 men and a Titan squadron for 600. Air Force officers at Vandenberg responsible for the ballistic-missile training program say that these requirements will ultimately be reduced as more automation becomes available.

Training for IRBM squadrons is proceeding at an accelerated pace in many parts of the United States, but the ICBM training program is off to a slower start. Probably the most advanced training on this front is to be found in Vandenberg's 576th Strategic Missile Squadron, where the cream of Air Force enlisted technicians and officers are undergoing various phases of Atlas launch-crew training which began last September. The 576th is a combination training and operational squadron, and it is a far cry from the kind of Atlas combat squadron that Defense Secretary McElroy envisioned would be on station and ready for action in January. In carefully censored hearings before the Senate, which McElroy seems to have overlooked, General Schriever explained that the missile training program for the various ICBM squadrons "is in the order of 30 months."

ARITHMETIC REGRESSION

Perhaps the key factor in our missile preparedness program during what has come to be called the dangerous early sixties will be the ratio between the number of launching pads and the number of available ICBM's. Although production figures are secret, no less authoritative a journal than Aviation Week recently disclosed that the Convair plant manufacturing the Atlas is operating at 40 percent of capacity. If, for the sake of argument, a total of 50 Atlas ICBM's are produced this year and a similar number in 1960 and 1961, by the end of the third year there will be many more missiles than available launching pads.

By early March, the Pentagon had announced plans to build five ICBM bases in addition to Vandenberg—four Atlas bases, consisting of Warren (near Cheyenne), Offutt (near Omaha, which is also SAC headquarters), Fairchild (near Spokane), and Forbes (near Topeka), plus a Titan base at Lowry (near Denver). Three weeks later, four additional missile bases were announced for construction next to existing operational airbases. Two of the four (Ellsworth near Rapid City, S. Dak., and Mountain Home near Boise, Idaho) were designated as

Titan bases, and the other two (Schilling naer Salina, Kans., and Lincoln near its namesake city in Nebraska) as additional Atlas bases. Present plans call for each of these missile areas to hold a single squadron, with the exception of Warren, which has been expanded in recent planning to house two more Atlas squadrons, and Lowry, which will have a second Titan squadron. Adding this up, one arrives at a total of three Titan bases and six Atlas bases, with Vandenberg—the 10th base—incorporating both Atlases and Titans.

The number of missiles planned for each base, however, has been revised by a policy decision, made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff last January, to both harden bases and disperse missiles.

Dispersal, according to a high-ranking missile officer, means "buying small plots of land scattered around the compass around the existing airbase. One launch site can be 15 miles from the base, another 10 miles, and a third 20 miles, with all of them many miles from one another and as much as 40 miles apart on opposite sides of the base." He told me that as part of the dispersal plan it had been decided to maintain 10 missiles and launching pads in Atlas and Titan ICBM squadrons. But he acknowledged that the communications problem between missile sites will be magnified tenfold as a resuit of dispersal.

With a total of 10 missile bases, 2 with additional squadrons, and 10 missiles to a squadron, the Nation would have—if all bases were completed on time—a total deterrent and retaliatory capability of 130 Atlas and Titan ICBM's on station in 1962. Present construction schedules, however, preclude ali 10 bases being completed by that time. Vandenberg is the most advanced in construction. Warren is a year behind, and its two additional squadrons will set back its semihardsite schedule by some 30 months more. Contracts for brick-and-mortar construction of missile-launching facilities have been recently allotted at Lowry and Offutt for one squadron each.

The Air Force admits that construction has not yet begun at any of the remaining programed sites, adding, however, that "certain preliminary soil investigation and site preparation is underway at the other locations." The Directorate of Installations at Ballistic Missile Division headquarters has acknowledged, without naming the bases involved, that some of the time-consuming land-acquisition program is still in the courts "and will be for some time to come."

STRIKE ONE—YOU'RE OUT?

With the prospect that by the end of 1962 we shall have far fewer launching sites ready than are now scheduled, it becomes more important than ever to establish the performance and capability of those which will be completed by that date. The question arises, first of all, whether these missile bases will be capable of launching a second salvo of ICBM's to follow our first retaliatory barrage. According to current military thinking, ICBM warfare will be more or less limited to a "strike" by the enemy and a "strikeback" by our own missiles. There seems to be general agreement in the Pentagon and among the missilemen at Vandenberg and the missile-weapons-system designers and evaluators in the manufacturing plants that there may well be no chance to reload and fire again.

A certain number of assumptions underlie this view: First, it is assumed that the enemy will know the location of most of our missile sites and will achieve a high proportion of direct hits and near misses. (Many military analysts, in and out of uniform, anticipate that in the event of a Soviet ICBM attack 60 percent of our ICBM retaliatory force would be knocked out.) Second, given the damage suffered from the strike, including intense radiation and widespread disruption of communications, the retaliatory strikeback will be largely limited to what can be achieved by missiles already in firing position and subject to automatic control. For those sites which escape damage from the original attack, the time factor alone presents almost insuperable obstacles to an effective second salvo. Some of the strikeback problems were taken up in the aforementioned congressional hearings with an admission by Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Thomas D. White that it would be a matter of considerably more time to set up new missiles on launching pads after the first salvo had been fired. In the give-and-take of the hearing an Air Force technical spokesman told the committee that there are two distinct disadvantages to thinking in terms of reloading and launching a second salvo. ."One is that the response rate (mechanical capability of launch sites for a second launch) is very low," he explained, "so they are vulnerable for a long period of time. Two, they must be reloaded in an environment which we have to assume is going to be very hostile to the reloading crew in terms of radiation hazard. Under these circumstances * * * you can only come to the conclusion that there is more value to providing some hardening than there is to providing additional soft missiles that are not on launch pads."

Another Air Force general officer in the missile field refused to comment on the availabiity of launching pads for a second shot, but admitted that even under ideal conditions it could take "some number of long hours" to pull another Atlas or Titan out of its storage hole, deliver it to the launching pad, emplace it, refuel it, check components, and then begin what is still a lengthy countdown procedure. The inescapable fact at present is that it will take an estimated day or longer to ready a launching pad for a second shot (assuming such a shot to be either possible or desirable). One of the civilian construction engineers at Vandenberg with launching-pad-construction experience at Canaveral frankly admits that the heat generated by powerful rocket engines often causes the thick steel plate covering the launch pad to melt and run. Excessive noise vigration also loosens steel supports and cracks even the special heat-resistant concrete that has been developed. He explained how at Canaveral thousands of tons of cooling water are sprayed under high pressure on a launching pad from which a research-and-development test vehicle is taking off. "And we still have to spend a day or two inspecting a cooled-down pad before we can use it again," he continued. "Some little thing is usually knocked out, and once in a while extensive repairs force us to down the pad for a week. No, I can't buy an operational launch site being used more than once in a 24- or 30-hour period."

There is, it appears, a more optimistic minority view which holds that completely hardened sites like those now envisaged for the Titan and later in the Atlas program will permit more than one salvo. But even this group concedes that the first soft sites now undergoing construction at Vandenberg and Warren would be useless after the first shot.

Ali this would seem—in the elusive mathematics of the missile controversy—to add up to the fact that of the 10 missile bases and 13 squadrons (including Vandenberg) now scheduled, only the hard-site squadrons—perhaps 6—can expect to remain in business after launching their first rounds. And since the state of the art during the dangerous early 1960's precludes all missiles functioning reliably, perhaps only 50 of the 60 missiles in those squadrons would be able to take off. Finally, one cannot assume, for either the Soviets or ourselves, that each and every missile will find its way to its respective target. Missile technology is such—and will be for some time to come—that a single malfunctioning component among the many tens of thousands of working parts in both our own and the Soviet missiles can send one of these awesome weapons well off its course.

SECURITY AND INSECURITY

The entire area of the Nation's retaliatory missile capability is shrouded in security and censorship, and is complicated by a series of constantly shifting evaluations and new technological developments in what the civilian director of the Atlas project calls "a period of technological obsolescence." New evaluations and conflicting claims are constantly publicized by Pentagon leaders seeking public and congressional support for either an increase in manpower or the acquisition of new types of missile hardware for their respective services. On the eve of the NATO foreign ministers' conference in Washington, statements by American military leaders declaring that we now have the power to "break Russia's back" were widely published. While admitting the Soviets' three-to-one lead in missiles, they asserted that the total capacity of our "mixed" forces was more than adequate for the job, and that U.S. nuclear delivery capability was far greater than that of the Soviet Union. A few days later the headlines carried a statement by Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC commander, flatly contradicting such assertions. In testimony before the House Appriations Subcommittee he declared. that SAC—the backbone of our mixed-force strategy—was rapidly "deteriorating" and that the B–47, which comprises roughly two-thirds of SAC's striking power, was obsolescent. Warning that the weapons lag was "risking the whole country," he asked that the B–47 be replaced. "I want more B–52's than are in the program," he declared, "and I want more Atlases—and I want them faster—and I want more B–58s."

As a result of such conflicting statements, public uncertainty over our defense policies is acute. In turn, the absence of reliable and consistent public information in the area of weapons development tends to cripple congressional efforts to force through decisions that would help close the missiie gap. The broad base of such decisions has been set forth by General Schriever; it lies in wide public recognition that "The nature and size of our forces must, at the earliest possible date, be such as to absorb an attack of many hundred missiles hurled at us simultaneously—and still retain the capability of devastating the aggressor. We simply don't know when the Soviets for their part will achieve their capability; therefore it is only safe to assume that they will have it sooner rather than later."

Mr. SYMINGTON. We are not only lagging in missile production, but our plans for dispersal and for hardening are such that it is going to take a long time to provide a truly operational picture.

General Schriever talked about an over 30 months' requirement from a flat start to get an operational missile on a hardened base. During that time it would certainly seem to be the better part of wisdom, to me, for us to modernize further our Strategic Air Force, which we can do with our present production facilities.

I will say to my able friend, it is my belief that liklihood of having a nuclear war is far less than the liklihood of having a conventional war. When I went to Berlin month before last, I found to my sorrow that we are not only heavily outmanned, but also our forces are not modernized.

As the Senator knows, the Russians are supposed to have 175 divisions, of which about 22 divisions are directly adjacent to West Germany, while we have only 5 divisions in that area. I do not understand why we do not modernize the equipment those five divisions have, in order to give them at least some change in case of Communist aggression. Nothing even approaching such modernization has been presented by the administration to date. Adequate modernization of our ground forces is one of our greatest needs.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. In further response to the question asked by my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, I wish to say that the pending military construction bill is geared to what I think is an inadequate production program for our intercontinental ballistic missile effort. It is my personal feeling that before the present session of Congress adjourns, we should come back with a supplemental authorization bill for additional base sites. In that way, if we add to the output of ICBM's, we will be able to take care of the long lead time items, which, of course, in this instance, happen to be the base sites. In other words, it takes much longer to have the bases ready to receive the delivery systems than it takes to produce the individual ballistic missiles.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Washington for his comments. I wonder if I correctly understand the positions of my friends from Washington and Missouri when I say that based at least to some extent on their better judgment it is my own view we need substantially more effort and substantially more money, first, to increase the production rate of intermediate and intercontinental ballistc missiles; secondly, to place more defensive missiles in support of the bases of the Strategic Air Force, and, third, to provide more dispersion of the Strategic Air Force than we have at present. I further believe that all of these things should be going forward at the same time, and that they will require substantially higher appropriations than are presently contemplated to be authorized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. More funds will be needed, if we don't get more effectiveness through some real unification in the services. The Senator is correct, particularly as regards ICBM's and dispersal of bases. The Senator has just been listening to a great authority on this subject, my able friend from the State of Washington. As for ICBM's, one must have the missile themselves, one must have dispersion of their bases, and one must have those bases adequately protected or hardened.

The point which the able Senator from Washington is making is entirely sound. Once one is in production of an ICBM it takes a great deal longer to build the base and to train the crews, than it takes to build the missile.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to see my friend from Washington is interested in this colloquy. I should like to ask another question.

For the relatively short period of years—3, 4, or 5 years—during which our Strategic Air Force must continue to be our primary deterrent against attack, is it not true we need an increase in the production of jet tankers to reduce the dependence of our strategic bombers on overseas bases, which are threatened by Russian missiles?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about that. Every expert testifies to the need. Yet, we are told that we cannot afford to build enough tankers.

Mr. CLARK. An adequate number of additional jet tankers, as I understand the situation, is not contemplated in the pending measure or in the other military authorization bills which will soon be before the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is not covered in this particular bill, of course, because this is a military construction bill.

Under oath several years ago the world's foremost authority, perhaps, on strategic air power, General LeMay, testified that the tanker program was totally inadequate. Yet, we still have a relatively small number operational and only about 96 more are provided for in the 1960 budget request.

Mr. CLARK. Is there not presently, also, an acute shortage of air crews for SAC, which limits the ability of SAC to maintain an air alert?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know the exact figures with respect to crews, but I know there has never been a time in recent years when SAC has had an adequate number of trained crews, according to the sworn testimony of the SAC authorities, such as General LeMay and General Power.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate that some of the lack of adequately trained air crews comes about as a result of the difficulties of recruiting personnel and holding them in service, but it is also to some extent the result of inadequate appropriations, is it not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator, as usual, is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to turn to another matter mentioned by my friend from Washington. Does my friend from Washington, as well as my friend from Missouri, feel we should be pressing ahead faster than we are in connection with the Polaris missile and our antisubmarine program?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have the floor. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania so that he may ask the distinguished Senator from Washington questions. The only reason I stated it in that way is that I am taking care to protect the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who asked unanimous consent to yield to me.

Mr. CLARK. I would be happy to have my friend from Missouri give his views on that question, also.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would prefer to have the Senator from Washington answer the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the observation made by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania. We should be making an all-out effort to achieve at the earliest possible date an invulnerable retaliatory deterrent. This involves, in my judgment, the Polaris weapons system. It involves the Minuteman, which, as the Senator knows, can be hardened by being placed in the bowels of the earth or on mobile platforms in various places.

I think this should be our primary objective. I believe the Soviet leaders are deterred from undertaking an all-out war against America and the free world by the possibility of an all-out retaliation from us. We must have in being, therefore, a deterrent which the enemy cannot destroy. It is that simple. Once we achieve such a deterrent, it seems to me, we shall have gone a long way toward providing assurance against an all-out nuclear or thermonuclear conflict.

Mr. CLARK. We do not have that deterrent in being today, do we?

Mr. JACKSON. We do not. We are far from having that kind of a deterrent today.

Mr. CLARK. I am grateful to my friend for his patience in continually yielding to me.

Let me turn to the third point the Senator made at the beginning of his talk; that in order to protect this country and to fulfill our worldwide commitments we must have the capacity to wage effectively limited war. It has been my judgment—and I ask my friend to either confirm it or modify it—that we do not have such a capacity today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We do not. Our deficiency in this respect is very serious.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that our troops are understrength; that our troops are armed with obsolete, World War II weapons; that our troops do not have adequate conventional ammunition with which to fight a "brush war"; that we tend to rely on tactical atomic weapons which we may never politically be in a position to utilize; that our Marine Corps is understrength and lacking in adequate airlift; and that this situation should be a matter of the first priority in connection with securing the safety of the United States of America and its position abroad?

I realize that that is a pretty comprehensive question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me answer my friend in this way: In order to have any chance with the relatively small Army we have, that Army should be modern and mobile. Several months ago I was having dinner with Mayor Brandt in Berlin. The question was asked me, "We are very glad that you do not intend to give an inch with respect to West Berlin, but how can we reconcile that with our knowledge that you plan further to reduce the number of combat divisions in your already small Army?"

I had no answer for that question, and I do not believe anyone else has an answer for it.

Each year the Army has petitioned the Joint Chiefs of Staff for adequate airlife Each year the Joint Chiefs of Staff

have rejected the petition of the Army for adequate airlift. Then the American people are told that the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not believe that we need more airlift. They are not told it was a decision by majority vote of the other services against spending the money so the Army could be mobile. That is one of the reasons why Gen. Maxwell Taylor has decided to resign, because of lack of mobility of his Army.

Another aspect of the Army's situation involves modernization of equipment, such as tanks and guns. As I mentioned in my speech, the gross national product of the United States is around $1¼ billion a day, and it would require less than a third of that amount of money added to the budget to give some reasonable amount of modernity to our Army. Neverthless, our already very small—relatively speaking—Army facing the Russians around Berlin has tanks which have less than one-half the range of the Russian tanks. The Russian tanks are newer than ours, having been built since World War II, while we have not even spent the money to change from gasoline engines to diesel engines in any quantity.

In addition, the heavy Russian tanks have 120 millimeter guns, whereas our tanks have a maximum of 105 millimeter guns.

If we have the right to draft boys from the farms and cities in peacetime to go into military service, we have the duty to give them the best equipment and the best training, in order to give them the best chance to do their jobs successfully and to return home safely. We are not performing this duty.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend for his frank and pertinent answer to my question.

Let me say briefly, for myself, that I stated on the floor of the Senate, as long ago as March 5 of this year, that in my judgment the appropriations recommended in the President's budget to preserve the security and defense of the United States were totally inadequate. I pointed out that the Gaither Committee, the Rockefeller Committee, and the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations had requested substantially larger appropriations, and that I hoped they would be forthcoming.

I find that this authorization for military construction cannot well be analyzed by an amateur in the field, as I am, without knowing what is to be done in other fields of military authorization and appropriation; and I would be sorely tempted to vote against the present bill as a protest against the inadequacy of the entire system if I did not believe that would be a futile gesture.

We must increase the number of Army divisions. We must bring the Marine Corps up to strength. We must give the Marine Corps an adequate airlift. We must modernize and protect our Strategic Air Force. We must move ahead more rapidly with the development of ballistic missiles, and give the Navy what it needs to go full steam ahead with the Polaris missile and antisubmarine warfare. In my judgment that cannot be done within the limits of the President's budget.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is an excellent summation of our needs. I thank my able friend from Pennsylvania for his fine contribution.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Chair informs the Senator from Colorado that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has the floor. He yielded, under a unanimous-consent agreement, to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], with the understanding that he would not lose the privilege of the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to introduce a bill and propound a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Colorado for the purpose of introduction of a bill and the propounding of a unanimous-consent request, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota include in his request the privilege of yielding to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]; and the request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may consider the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, and that that be done without the Senator from South Dakota losing his right to the floor at the conclusion of consideration of the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I so request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Also that there may be a quorum call without the Senator from South Dakota losing the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to yield with the same understanding.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

THE BUDGET

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from South Dakota in yielding to me. I point out that the Senator from Colorado has been standing on his feet on the floor for 33 minutes, attempting to gain recognition, during which time a number of Senators spoke. Some of them questioned the Senator from Missouri, who temporarily had the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which was reprinted in the Ohio Republican News, and which I believe deserves wide readership.

It contains in a very brief and clear analysis, a restatement of some of the facts of economic life.

All the politically motivated nonsense I have been reading in the RECORD will not make it otherwise. There is only one way to balance a budget and that is to adjust expenditures to income. Any effort to avoid these facts is not only unrealistic, but unfair to our children and their children, when we leave them nothing but a heritage of debt.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAMILY BUDGET

(Editorial reprinted from the Cleveland Plain Dealer)

At one time or another the head of every prudent family tries to make out a budget. He or she first writes down the amount of income the family can reasonably expect during a given period. Against that there are certain expenses which must be met, such as rent or mortgage payments, taxes, utilities, food, clothing, transportation, and insurance.

Too often, alas, these amounts eat up all the anticipated income, but sometimes, after the necessities have been provided for, there is something left over for other things, such as entertainment, vacation trips, new furniture and so on. The problem then is to decide which of thees other things the family can afford. Obviously, the family can't have everything it wants because if it could there would be no budget problem to worry about.

But the leftwing Democrats who are complaining that President Eisenhower's $77 billion budget isn't big enough would go about things in a different way. First they would list everything that the family wants under the heading of necessities and, if there wasn't enough money coming in to pay for them, they would borrow the balance.

That's what has been done all too often in the past, so that the Federal debt is now above $280 billion, a staggering amount. But the people who have loaned this money to the Government expect to earn interest on it, and that includes holders of $25 U.S. savings bonds, as well as the banks and insurance companies that buy larger amounts of Government bonds in long- and short-term issues. As a result, interest on the Government debt is one of the big, irreducible items in the Federal budget. It amounted to $7½ billion this year and will be over $8 billion next year.

That brings us to the spokesman of the Democratic leftwingers, the Democratic Advisory Council. It complains that "the only people who benefit in a big way from the new budget are those who have money and lend it to the Government." That's because the Government has had to increase its interest rates in order to induce the owners of capital to lend it to the Government. If the people who have money to lend can get better interest rates elsewhere, or if they fear that inflation will erode the value of their money if they put it in Government bonds, they will invest in something else.

As Raymond Moley pointed out in a column on this page, the time might come when the Government couldn't borrow any more money to finance its deficits. Then it would have to resort to the printing press and runaway inflation would be up on us.

The Democratic Advisory Committee is completely oblivious to this potential disaster. It wants the Government to spend more, to borrow more, and to cut down on interest rates, thus leading to a situation when the Government could no longer borrow. It's the classic road to ruin, whether it happens to your family's budget or the Government's.

(At this point Mr. ALLOTT introduced a bill, which appears elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1959 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1960—Continued

CORPORATIONS (TITLE II)

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1959 [1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended by House for 1960	Amount recommended by Senate	Conference allowance, 1960
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses	($2,297,000)	($2,330,000)	($2,330,000)	($2,330,000)	($2,330,000)
Commodity Credit Corporation:					
Restoration of capital impairment	1,760,399,886	1,535,424,413	1,435,424,413	1,435,424,413	1,435,424,413
Administrative expense limitation	($39,600,000)	(45,300,000)	(39,600,000)	(42,771,000)	(42,000,000)
Total, Commodity Credit Corporation	1,760,399,886	1,535,424,413	1,435,424,413	1,435,424,413	1,435,424,413
Reimbursements to Commodity Credit Corporation for special activities:					
International Wheat Agreement	80,800,000	63,875,000	63,875,000	63,875,000	63,875,000
Emergency famine relief	119,270,000	104,508,000	104,508,000	104,508,000	104,508,000
Sales for local currencies (Public Law 480)	1,033,515,000	968,016,000	968,016,000	968,016,000	968,016,000
Migratory waterfowl feed	18,506	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Bartered materials for stockpile	82,250,335	129,000,000	129,000,000	129,000,000	129,000,000
Animal disease eradication	19,390,100	1,056,500	1,056,500	1,056,500	1,056,500
Grading and classing activities	1,510,870	1,607,000	1,607,000	1,607,000	1,607,000
Total, reimbursements to CCC for special activities	1,336,754,811	1,268,097,500	1,268,097,500	1,268,097,500	1,268,097,500
Total, Corporations	3,097,154,697	2,803,521,913	2,703,521,913	2,703,521,913	2,703,521,913

RELATED AGENCIES (TITLE III)

Farm Credit Administration	($2,125,000)	($2,125,000)	($2,125,000)	($2,125,000)	($2,125,000)
Federal intermediate credit banks	(1,693,000)				
Total, related agencies	(3,818,000)	(2,125,000)	(2,125,000)	(2,125,500)	(2,125,000)
Total, titles I through III	[1] 4,813,330,350	4,091,364,863	3,939,165,498	3,975,774,848	3,971,362,673

Loan authorizations

Rural Electrification Administration:					
Electrification	$317,000,000	$136,000,000	$136,000,000	$136,000,000	$136,000,000
Telephone	67,500,000	79,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	384,500,000	215,000,000	215,000,000	215,000,000	215,000,000
Farmers Home Administration:					
Farm ownership	24,000,000	12,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
Farm operation (production and subsistence)	180,000,000	160,000,000	180,000,000	180,000,000	180,000,000
Soil and water conservation	5,500,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	209,500,000	173,000,000	206,000,000	206,000,000	206,000,000
Total, loan authorizations	594,000,000	388,000,000	421,000,000	421,000,000	421,000,000

Permanent authorizations

Agency and item	Authorizations, 1959	Estimates, 1960	Increase or decrease
Agricultural Research Service:			
Alterations and improvements, Animal Quarantine Station, Clifton, N.J.	$30,000		−$30,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:			
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	235,936,663	$246,000,000	+10,063,337
Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act fund	675,000	685,000	+10,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	236,611,663	246,685,000	+10,073,337
Commodity Stabilization Service: National Wool Act	24,453,099	47,630,000	+23,176,901
Total, permanent authorizations	261,094,762	294,315,000	+33,220,238

[1] Includes all adjustments for pay act, penalty mail, and other costs covered in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959.

[2] An appropriation of $53,715,000 was provided for 1959. Amount reduced by transfers to other activities for pay increases and penalty mail costs as provided in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959.

[3] An appropriation of $200,000,000 was provided for 1959. Amount reduced by transfers for pay costs, penalty mail, and other costs as provided in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959.

[4] Funds requested for liquidation merged with conservation reserve and $600,000 approved by conferees.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate is the military construction authorization bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there have been quite a few inquiries as to how much more debate there will be, how many more amendments will be offered, and whether there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the passage of the bill. I think we should have a yea-and-nay vote on passage of the bill. I think the committee has agreed to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I do not believe the amendments will require yea and nay votes; I believe they can be disposed of more simply.

The Senator from South Dakota has some very pertinent remarks to make. Perhaps we can finish the debate within an hour, or slightly more, if we have relevant comments.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Mississippi for the purpose of having the yeas and nays ordered, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. On the passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the authorization bill for military construction, which is now the pending business—may not ordinarily be thought

of as a policy bill, but those who have worked with the bill through the years have come to realize that whether we planned it that way, desired it that way——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Conversations will be held in the cloakrooms.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Presiding Officer insist on order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will insist on order. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, those who have worked through the years on this bill have learned, whether we wished it that way or willed it that way, that the authorization bill for military construction has become a policy bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That fact was never more evident than in respect to our work upon the particular bill now before the Senate. The bill is sizable in dollars, containing some $1.2-billion-odd in authorizations, but it is far more important than the dollars when we came to consider the questions involved. As the bill came to us from the House of Representatives and as presented by the installations officers of the Defense Department it called for augmenting the authorization for the Nike-Hercules system and also for the Bomarc system. Both of these are terms which are applied to a defense missile system; the Nike-Hercules being the relatively short-range missile with a maximum effectiveness of 80 miles, and the Bomarc being a 200-mile defense system in its initial stage, the Bomarc-A, or up to 400 or 450 miles in the second generation, the Bomarc-B missile.

Consideration of those proposals led the committee, as has already been stated on the floor today, to propose that we deauthorize some prior authorizations for these defense weapons, and also refuse authorization for the new, until the Defense Department has come up with a review of its request. That resulted in bringing before the Armed Services Committee, and now before the Senate, two reports. One report deals with the items in the bill exclusive of the items for the defense missile systems. The second, or the supplementary report, deals with those.

During the early part of the debate we had considerable discussion of this matter, and I shall not go into any extended review of the bill or even of these systems, but I should like to emphasize a few points.

The bill is noteworthy not only for its treatment of the Nike-Hercules and Bomarc questions, but also for the curtailment of the hospital program, for the committee recommended that certain hospitals not be authorized and, further, that the Defense Department seek to bring its estimates into line. We found too much variation between costs at hospitals recommended by one service and another service, and too much difference between hospital costs per bed in the service hospitals and costs per bed found in the civilian economy.

The bill is notable also for what it does in the field of military housing, particularly the so-called Capehart housing program, on which I shall say more a little later.

The bill is noteworthy also because it proposes to create authority for a Norad headquarters. Many Members of the Congress have visited the SAC headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, but few Members have visited the Norad headquarters, or the North American Air Defense Command headquarters, at Colorado Springs, Colo. Those who have visited the headquarters have been struck by the disparity between the facilities afforded for the Air Defense Command headquarters as compared with those afforded for SAC headquarters.

The bill is also noteworthy for what it does in regard to the reserve program. We have spelled out certain recommendations for National Guard armories, and I think we have set up some landmarks which will be helpful to every Member of Congress in answering inquiries he receives from his home State in this regard.

Mr. President, I should like to say a few words about the so-called master plan, the revised plan for the defense missiles systems, Nike-Hercules and Bomarc. Our committee report says:

> In accepting the revised plan and amending the bill accordingly, the committee does so with some deference to the review that was made. However, the committee still has some reservations about the premises and philosophy employed in the plan.

At that point I should say that the Senator from South Dakota has some very definite reservations about the premises and philosophy employed in the plan.

I certainly agree with the following sentence in our committee report:

> The committee questions whether too much reliance is being placed upon defense as compared to sharpening our offense with modernization of the Army, the fleet, or perhaps more emphasis on manned interceptors.

The report further states:

> The committee expects the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to again carefully review the proposed program before construction is begun on new sites.

To make certain that there would be further review, we wrote into the bill a new section, section 418, which requires the Secretary of Defense to make certain reviews, and in those reviews to give us the assurance that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are satisfied with certain aspects of the revised program.

It is my personal opinion that the committee was abundantly justified in accepting a plan which will save $1,400,000,000 over the next several years, but we might have gone further, I think, and deauthorized some of the prior authorizations for certain defense weapon installations. The reason is this: No program suggested to the committee proposed placing either Nike-Hercules or a Bomarc system in sufficient numbers to cover all the important targets in the United States. The result is that a relatively few points would have a point defense system. A few areas would have an area defense system, but there would be left unprotected a sufficient number of targets so that an incoming group of enemy bombers, if they did not want to strike at one of the defended systems could easily find an alternate target of almost equal attractiveness. That would simply mean that if we assume that either Nike-Hercules or Bomarc would be 100 percent effective—which, parenthetically, I say is a considerable assumption—or that they would be anywhere near 100 percent effective, there would be still left enough alternate targets so that an incoming bomber could find another target beyond the range of either of these defense systems.

That would mean that the major defense reliance, if we were to stop an incoming bomber, would have to go to the interceptors or fighters, which have considerably more range and much more flexibility. That is why I, for one, strongly emphasize the suggestion in the report that—

> The committee questions whether too much reliance is being placed upon defense as compared to sharpening our offense with modernization of the Army, the fleet, and perhaps more emphasis on manned interceptors.

The opinion has been expressed by Senators on the floor of the Senate, and by others, that a good defense system is in itself a powerful deterrent. The Senator from South Dakota takes little comfort in any such hope. Personally, I do not believe that the Soviets, or any other possible adversary, would be too greatly concerned about what we might do if they once got bombers into the country. The capabilities which we are demonstrating with such techniques as the Hound Dog, in which a bomber carries piggyback a missile that can be launched several hundred miles from the target, means that the enemy bomber could stand off a considerable distance and lob in its missiles, beyond the range of the defense systems such as Nike-Hercules or Bomarc.

When I think of that situation, I am reminded of an actual occurrence in my State some years ago. A man was on trial for a particularly heinous or aggravated sort of crime. The prosecution was relying very heavily on the fact that some bloodhounds had been used to follow the trail right to the very door of the man who was accused of the crime.

The defense attorney placed on the stand the man who had the bloodhounds in charge and asked him how he could be sure that the bloodhounds had trailed the man to his own door. The man who had the bloodhounds testified that they had gone right to the door and placed their paws on the very door of the man who had been accused.

The defense attorney asked him, "Don't you know that this man has a wife and two lovely little girls? Weren't

you afraid that, with the bloodhounds putting their paws on the door, the family might think that there was someone knocking at the door and open the door, permitting the bloodhounds to burst in on the wife and little girls?"

The man in charge of the bloodhounds said, "They couldn't."

The defense attorney asked, "Why not?"

The witness replied, "I had them on a leash."

Then the defense attorney said, "You led them there, didn't you?"

Of course, the case fell pretty flat, because it was obvious that, with the bloodhounds on a leash, they went where the man took them.

There is no certainty that any incoming planes would go to the point where we might have a Nike-Hercules or Bomarc, unless we had them on a leash. They would use alternate targets, or stand outside the range and lob their missiles into the Nike-Hercules or Bomarc area.

So I say that any reliance upon defense as deterrent does not register very heavily with the Senator from South Dakota. I do not believe the enemy would be deterred by an incomplete and scattered presentation of fixed antiplane weapons. If they are tied down, they are tied down, and incoming bombers would simply go to other places, or stand off and lob their missiles in.

So our primary deterrent reliance must still be in a capable offense. That means strategic bombers and medium-range bombers, if they are so placed that they can go to the targets on their own, or if they can be refueled and get to the targets; it means reliance on the offensive striking capability of carriers or carrier-based aircraft.

Perhaps the greatest hope right now for strengthening our offense is the rapid development of the Polaris, tied to atomic-powered submarines. I, for one, would not want the RECORD to indicate that I believe that even with the so-called revised master plan, we are accomplishing very much in the way of deterrence, or even of defense. It therefore becomes of interest to everyone who wants the security of the United States to be improved, strengthened, and maintained, that we insure the capability of our striking arms. If we take note of the testimony of the past week before another committee of the Congress, it must become apparent to anyone that the world is approaching a situation in which any launching of a nuclear war may bring destruction for both the so-called victor and the vanquished.

President Eisenhower has said on various occasions that in the next war the only difference between the victor and the vanquished would be in the degree of destruction. That being so, we are well advised to bend every effort to try to find some solution for the problems of the world at conference tables, rather than through the arbitrament of a nuclear war.

I wish to direct attention to two or three specific things in the bill. In the report on the House bill, as it was originally presented, to accompany House bill 5674, at page 9 we find a paragraph on the Naval Air Station at Rota, Spain. The paragraph reads:

> The committee has deleted from the bill an authorization request for operational facilities at the Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain, in the amount of $11,934,000. If granted, this authorization would permit the dredging of Rota Harbor to a depth of 40 feet for the purpose of permitting large tankers and certain carriers to go alongside a pier. Considerable sums have been previously authorized and obligated for facilities at this naval air station, including dredging the harbor to a depth of 35 feet. After carefully considering testimony and other data relating to this project, the committee is of the opinion that it does not have the priority of others that are being deferred. Present facilities are sufficient to accommodate large tankers. The committee believes that the funds required to accomplish this dredging might better be used for modernizing the fleet and other high priority requirements.

The committee wrote and endorsed that paragraph because we had heard Admiral Burke and others testify that there was a great need for improvements in the existing fleet. We also heard, and I think with some regret, that the plans for a new aircraft carrier called for it to be powered with conventional engines. I myself feel that if we are to build another carrier, we ought to go the full road and provide nuclear power for it. It will take 3 or 4 years to build it. When it is finished, I do not want it to be obsolete. Four years from now a new carrier conventionally powered will be, if not obsolete, certainly at a great disadvantage. The increasing speed of submarines and the very large number of submarines which the Soviet Union has suggest that a conventionally powered carrier will be at a great disadvantage 5 years from today. If we are to build a new carrier, I hope we will have enough courage and can find the funds to provide for equipping it with nuclear power, so that it will have speed and endurance on the ocean and can stay out for long enough periods of time to give it a chance to perform the missions it should perform.

So when we were evaluating priorities, we deleted the Rota Harbor item. However, the Navy made a second request for it. They interviewed members of the committee personally. When we got down to brass tacks, the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] asked the Senator from South Dakota to look into the matter when I was in Europe. I was there for the purpose of attending the Interparliamentary Union. I was able to get away after the committee sessions had concluded and went to Spain to make some inquiries. I talked with the captain who has charge of naval construction. I talked with some of the Air Force personnel who will have the benefit of the petroleum fuel supplies which would come in through Rota Harbor. I found they had already been getting supplies from some of the large tankers having a draft of about 37 feet. So the committee decided to delay the item.

However, upon further presentation by the Navy, and particularly based on their plea to have the harbor developed so that some of the new class carriers could enter, the committee restored the item in the amount of $5,400,000. Representatives of the Navy, after reviewing the whole situation and talking with us, decided they could do the job for $5,400,000, because the carrier would not come in very often, and this amount will provide a channel which will enable the carrier to come alongside the pier. The new proposal merely eliminates a turnaround basin which would have been installed at the end of the harbor. Since the carriers come in very infrequently, it was felt that they could back out without too much difficulty.

This provision makes it possible for the bill to represent a saving of $6,500,000 as compared with the original estimate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly, so that I may comment on the Rota Harbor matter? I should like to have my remarks on that item appear following the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I point out a very signal service which I think the Senator from South Dakota has rendered to the Senate, to Congress, and to the Navy, too, with reference to his development of facts and his inquiries concerning the harbor at Rota. Originally, the item provided $11.9 million as the amount necessary to make that harbor serviceable for the carriers and the tankers. The Senator from South Dakota went to Europe to attend the NATO Conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. STENNIS. He was advertised before the Nation as having gone to Europe for an Easter vacation. As a matter of fact, he was in Europe on official business and while there had the opportunity to look into this matter. Directly due to his views and suggestions concerning another way to use the harbor, the Navy cooperated. Now, instead of having a recommendation of $11.9 million, the amount is $5.4 million. All the essential services will be carried out under the $5.4 million plan. So a saving of $6.5 million has been effected. This is not only an illustration of the Senator's fine service in his capacity as a Member of this body; it also illustrates the value and the wisdom of checking, rechecking, and getting new viewpoints and additional facts in order to pass upon a matter. I commend the Senator from South Dakota very highly. It is due particularly to his work that this saving was made, and the Navy was willing to cooperate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. In all fairness, I should say, however, that the Senator from Mississippi himself was in the area of Rota Harbor a year earlier. I think some doubts entered his mind at that time about the rather grand scheme which he thought was evolving for Rota Harbor, so he suggested to me that I look into the matter. Therefore, the credit certainly extends to the Senator from Mississippi, if any credit is due anywhere.

The next item to which I call attention is the Air Force Academy item. The committee, in its basic report, at page 10, said:

The committee is greatly concerned over many aspects of the construction program at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colo.

The Comptroller General of the United States in a report dated April 1959, states that the original authorization of $139 million will have been expanded without specific authority from Congress to $269 million. This seems to be a disregard of congressional authority.

The committee took considerable testimony on that point.

We were disturbed by the evidence that there is being expended or has been obligated $269 million for the Air Force Academy, whereas the original authorization came to about $139 million, so the expenditure is practically double what the legislative authorization was for the Air Force Academy.

We had hearings with some of the representative of the Air Force on the matter. The precise legal authority may be a little cloudy, but it seems that the position of the Air Force is that the original authorization related to land and structural facilities; that the authority for the equipment and some of the interior features of the buildings, they hold, derived from other authority in general legislation.

Regardless of that, I am certain it is shocking to anyone who has followed the history of the Air Force Academy to find that we are spending some $269 million whereas only $139 million had been set forth in express authority. Because of that, the committee considered an amendment, and I have been authorized to present it. I think it was understood that this would be considered as a committee amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. We had that under consideration, and it has the approval of the subcommittee. I am sure it was considered by some of the members of the full committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall read it, but I shall not call it up until I have concluded my remarks. On page 40, after line 24, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 307. Except as specifically authorized by legislation hereafter enacted, no contract shall be entered into by the Department of the Air Force or the Air Force after the effective date of this act for (1) the acquisition of any interest in real property, (2) the grading, landscaping, or improvement of any real property, or (3) the construction of any structure or facility at, or in connection with, the Air Force Academy if that contract provides for the expenditure of any amount in excess of $25,000.

I send the amendment to the desk and shall call it up later.

The next item to which I wish to call specific attention is the housing program. As has been pointed out, the bill contemplates the continuation of the so-called Capehart housing program. Today, we understand, is the last day on which the President might sign the housing bill now before him. I have not been advised whether he will sign it or veto it. But if he were going to sign it, I assume it might have been signed prior to this late hour on this day.

In any event, in order to insure that there be no interruption in the Capehart housing program, the committee has authorized me to present an amendment the purpose of which is to extend that program. The amendment would extend the provisions of the National Housing Act which are embraced in section 803. Section 803 of the National Housing Act closes with this proviso:

Provided further, That no mortgage shall be insured under this title after June 30, 1959, except pursuant to a commitment to insure issued before such date.

The language we propose in the amendment changes the proviso to read:

No more mortgages shall be insured under this title after September 30, 1960, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date, and not more than 20,000 family housing units shall be contracted for after June 30, 1959, pursuant to any mortgage insured under section 803 of this title after such date.

Then there is another paragraph, which I shall not take the time to read; but it reinforces the 20,000-unit limitation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, earlier today, in my colloquy with the Senator from Mississippi, I referred to section 809 housing. I said that section 809 is badly needed around the research and development installations. At that time I had not seen the Senator's amendment. Shortly afterward, the Senator from South Dakota showed me the proposed amendment; and I noted that section 809 housing is covered.

I understand that what the Senator from South Dakota has done is to include a provision which will continue what is popularly known as Capehart housing—that is to say, housing under section 803 of the Housing Act—and also section 809 housing, which is the housing around research and development installations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Let me reread the proviso which is included in the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I heard the Senator read it a few minutes ago, and I notice that in it he continued the proviso that not more than 20,000 units shall be built under section 803, which is the section which deals with Capehart housing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; but it extends the life of the title until September 30, 1960; and the title of the Housing Act embraces both section 803 and section 809.

So the housing in the research and development areas, under section 809, would also be extended, under the proposed language. But the 20,000-unit limitation will apply specifically to the Capehart housing, which comes under section 803 of that title.

Mr. President, the committee is of the opinion that there is a continuing need for military housing to be constructed under the Capehart housing provisions; and in the pending measure the committee has authorized a total of 23,821 units.

I hope the Department has the same doubts as to the firmness of many of those requirements. It is desired that the Department of Defense carefully review this program, to assure that only the essential requirements are met—giving preference only to those of the most urgent nature.

Therefore the committee has so phrased the proviso that the 20,000 units would be all that could be contracted for under this extension, and the committee assumes that the Department of Defense will use those 20,000 units in stations of the highest priority among those that are authorized.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. What criteria are sought to be applied in determining the priority?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With respect to every installation where Capehart housing is proposed, the Department of Defense sets up its estimate of requirements for the mission of the station. Then it determines how many can be taken care of by any existing units which are not substandard. It may take into account substandard housing units which may be built up to a proper standard. It also takes into consideration those that can be provided by the local economy. Where there is the greatest deficiency and when there is no prospect that the necessary housing will be provided by the local economy, the Capehart provision will provide for housing up to the 20,000-unit total limitation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I assume the Department will take into consideration the continuing activities on any base.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. In fact, the base is required to have a certification that it is of a permanent character, before any such housing is authorized.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I understand. But suppose a base should, in the judgment of the military, be reduced in the future—knowledge which only the military might have earlier. Would that be taken into consideration?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If in the planning the Department of Defense contemplated a reduction in the number of men at a base, I am sure that fact would be reflected in its proposals for additional housing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before this measure is acted on by the Senate, I should like to state that, as I indicated in the remarks I made earlier today, I have some question as to the propriety of the action proposed, because both section 803 housing and section 809 housing constitute programs provided for under the National Housing Act. That act, from its very inception in 1934, came within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, and so did all the amendments to it. I do not believe it was ever supposed that the Armed Services Com-

mittee or any other committee except the Banking and Currency Committee would assume jurisdiction of that program.

I do not make that statement only because I am interested in the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. But I think we had better proceed in an orderly fashion, and I believe we should observe the guidelines which have been established for the handling of such legislation.

Housing is a complicated subject. The entire FHA insurance program is complicated, and fits together like the pieces of a jig-saw puzzle. We do not profit by having one part of the housing program in the jurisdiction of one committee and another part of the housing program in the jurisdiction of another committee.

I have stated many times, both here on the floor and to other Senators, including the Senator from Mississippi, that, certainly, housing for military personnel, to be built with appropriated funds, should be handled by the Armed Services Committee. I do not think there is any question about that.

But when it comes to an FHA insured program, I think it should be handled by the committee which has handled such measures for the last 25 years.

I recognize the urgency of the occasion. That is what prompts the Senator from South Dakota, I understand, to propose this action, and it is what prompted other members of the committee to be willing to go along with it, and certainly it is what makes me reluctant to protest about it.

The military housing program is about to expire. Section 809 housing will expire at midnight tonight.

I happen to know that various places in the country need section 809 housing. Today, I received a long-distance telephone call in regard to a military installation. There had been a transfer of military personnel; and this situation is one of those in which the FHA normally will not participate. The FHA issues commitments based upon what it calls economic soundness; and the FHA measures the expected growth of the community separate and apart from military installations. Therefore, the FHA will not issue commitments for those who are moving in, in the case to which I refer, which involves a great number of persons. The only way they can obtain housing is through the section 809 program or a similar one.

I felt very badly to have to tell the mayor of that city that section 809 will expire at midnight tonight, unless the President signs the housing bill. I made clear to the mayor that I was not sure whether his city would be able to qualify under that measure, even if the President did sign it, because the Department of Defense has to declare the installation to be of the type that is supposed to receive such help.

At any rate, there is an urgent situation, and in view of that, I shall not offer any protest.

I have consulted with the Senator from South Dakota; and I made to him a suggestion with reference to the change which has been made in the amendment. I am willing to see this measure go through.

Let me say, further, that I hope this action will not be regarded as establishing a precedent. As I said to the Senator from Mississippi, if the Armed Services Committee would take over the responsibility for measures providing housing for military installations, on an appropriated basis, that is what I should like to see done. I think that would result in more housing for less money; and of course I would be willing to have the Armed Services Committee take over that field, and relieve our committee of that responsibility.

But so long as the program is tied in with the FHA insurance programs, I believe it belongs under the jurisdiction of the committee which has jurisdiction of other FHA insurance programs—namely, the Banking and Currency Committee.

Although I am not protesting at this time, I want it to be understood that I certainly hope this action will not be regarded as establishing a precedent.

Furthermore, when the President signs the housing bill, which now is on his desk,—and he has several more days in which he can sign it—I assume the provision will be dropped in conferencc, because in the housing bill there is a provision very similar to this amendment.

With that explanation, I certainly will not lodge any protest.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation for the very fine cooperation of the Senator from Alabama and his committee; and I wish to state that we certainly do not regard this case as a precedent, and we are not changing the policy which his committee has established, and in this measure we are not changing this law. We are simply continuing its breadth for this limited time, due to this emergency. If the emergency disappears, we shall drop the matter in conference, as we planned, except for the 20,000-unit limitation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I, too, wish to express to the Senator from Alabama my appreciation for his understanding attitude. There is no desire on the part of our committee to take over the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. We do have the responsibility of authorizing such housing construction as is necessary for the Defense Establishment.

If there were to be no Capehart housing program, we would face the responsibility of authorizing some housing directly by appropriated funds, in view of the situation which has been set forth. We had the choice either of doing that or of assuring that the Capehart program would be extended. The committee, consistent with the attitude of the Senate in approving the Capehart program, felt we should insure its continuance by the inclusion of this provision.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the committee on which the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from South Dakota serve will take a good look at the military housing program, with the thought in mind that it would be far wiser to provide for it out of appropriated funds.

As a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, each year it has seemed to me that it was the obligation of the Military Establishment to provide housing for military personnel in and about bases, and that such a program should not be mixed up with the FHA and the VA programs, where we get into problems of priorities, special assistance funds, bond markets, and the availability of credit. But this affects a need for soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States at our military installations.

I hope the committee will take another look at the question and see whether such housing should not be provided with appropriated funds. I should like to announce my complete agreement with the statement of the Senator from Alabama on that point.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to thank the Senator from Mississippi, chairman of the subcommittee, and the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for the broadminded way in which they have handled this whole matter. I think it shows a fine spirit. I know everybody connected with the project will appreciate their attitude very much.

One of the biggest problems facing the military for many years has been the problem of housing its personnel. When I was in World War I, 40-odd years ago, I think 75 or 80 percent of those in the Armed Forces were single, and 20 or 25 percent were married. Today, the situation is reversed. About 75 percent of the military personnel are married, and about 25 percent are single.

The military has faced the problem of having men reenlist so that there could be maintained what we call a professional Army. One of the problems involved was that a boy could serve 3 years or longer, but he could never find a decent place in which to house his family. However, if he left the service, the next day he could go to the Veterans' Administration, and arrange to buy a house for "X" amount of money, without any downpayment, and pay for it over a period of 30 or 35 years. If he stayed in the Army, he could not find a decent place in which to house his family.

Nobody is to blame for that situation. It would be necessary to appropriate billions of dollars to provide for 100,000 units. As we know, we are spending too much money now. Taxes are too high, and expenditures are too great. So that kind of appropriation could not be made.

Nobody is to be criticized for that situation.

What is proposed is that the housing can be paid for by military personnel out of their rental allowance. One tak-

ing advantage of the law would be entitled to the same right a veteran has, of being able to obtain a house with no downpayment and have 30 years to pay for it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Except in this instance the Government is going to own the house.

Mr. CAPEHART. In this instance, at the end of 30 years, the Government will own 100,000 houses, and they will not cost the Government any money. In the meantime, the military personnel will have suitable houses in which to live.

There is no question that it would be better if Congress could appropriate the money for such housing. We must be realistic. We do not have the money to appropriate for that purpose. Bonds would have to be sold to get the money with which to build the houses. The Government would sell mortgages to private enterprise, the banks, and let the banks amortize the mortgages over a 30-year period.

Some day we may get our financial affairs in good enough condition to be able to appropriate money to build such houses. Until we can do it, I do not know of anybody who is not enthusiastic about building the houses under the plan we are proposing.

I think we should be very careful that we do not overbuild. We do not want to permit more houses to be built in any given area than are needed. We ought to look three times before such houses are authorized, because I can think of nothing more undesirable than to have 25 units built in a certain area, and, 10 years later, have the military installation abandoned and have a situation where those housing units are no longer needed.

I think if common sense and caution are used all the way through such a program, and if we do not go wild, such a program will be good for the future. I think it has been a good thing in the past. I congratulate those who have handled the bill today for the way in which they have done it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana has made a very good statement on the whole problem. If the Government had the funds to appropriate, undoubtedly we could save money in the long run by building the houses directly with appropriated funds; but, under present conditions, what we have done, has been the way to provide needed houses, and it has resulted in some very good housing, and we feel justified in seeking its continuance.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I have had the great privilege of serving on this committee this year under the able chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. He has proved himself again, as he has in many other instanes, absolutely fair, and he has shown statesmanship and soundness in his approach to the problems coming before the committee.

This year we had the privilege of having additional members on the committee. I regard them as having been of great help to the committee. They have brought to the committee new experiences and new points of view. They have all made contributions. So has Mr. Nease, clerk of the committee.

Mr. President, I should like to call up and move the adoption of the first amendment I send to the desk, the $25,000 limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 40, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 307. Except as specifically authorized by legislation hereafter enacted, no contract shall be entered into by the Department of the Air Force or the Air Force after the effective date of this act for (1) the acquisition of any interest in real property, (2) the grading, landscaping, or improvement of any real property, or (3) the construction, completion, alteration, expansion, modification, or improvement of any structure or facility at, or in connection with, the Air Force Academy if that contract provides for the expenditure of any amount in excess of $25,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I now call up my housing amendment, which has been discussed at some length. In view of the fact that it has been read, unless there is a request for its reading, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD in full at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, to the committee amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 51, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 414. (a) Section 803(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*And provided further*, That no more mortgages shall be insured under this title after September 30, 1960, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date, and not more than twenty thousand family housing units shall be contracted for after June 30, 1959, pursuant to any mortgage insured under section 803 of this title after such date.'

"(b) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104(b), 204(b), and 304(b) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for after June 30, 1959, and before October 1, 1960, pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of twenty thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this section. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary to advance any further argument in favor of the amendment. The Senator from Alabama has indicated he has no objection. The Senator from Indiana has no objection. I know of no opposition to it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Before the Senate acts on the amendment, I should like to say I have been involved in two committee meetings this afternoon, the District of Columbia Committee, and then, following that, the Foreign Relations Committee, and I was called to the floor in order to present my views on this matter because I understood it was under discussion.

It may be that something has already taken place on the floor in regard to it, so I should like to have the help of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Mississippi.

Some of my constituents who are involved in the title insurance business have written me expressing their concern over section 415D of House bill 5674, regarding Government guarantee of land title on Capehart housing projects. They feel that by allowing the Justice Department to guarantee such land titles, their businesses will be sorely affected. They feel that the many title and loan associations throughout the country are able to perform this service adequately, and that the Government should not deprive them of this business.

I should like to ask whichever Senator wishes to answer to respond to the inquiry why this section was included in the bill. Was it to deprive these concerns of their business or was it to give the Attorney General a duty which he already performs in the case of other Government projects?

My understanding is that it will save the Government about $6 million. I am going to insert in the RECORD, if I may, some communications I have received from the title insurance people in my State and my response to their inquiry.

On June 2, I received a telegram from the Harney County Abstract & Title Co., of Burns, Oreg.

I said in my reply of June 5:

JUNE 5, 1959.

HARNEY COUNTY ABSTRACT & TITLE CO.,
Burns, Oreg.

GENTLEMEN: This letter is in reply to your telegram of June 2 referring to H.R. 5674, section 415D concerning Government guarantee of land titles on Capehart housing projects. The House of Representatives has passed H.R. 5674, and it has been reported to the Senate by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

As our committee explained in its report on the bill, the purpose of the amendment is to standardize already existing Government procedure. The amendment "will require this service to be performed by the Department of Justice as it is on all other Government property (Senate Rept. 296 on H.R. 5674, p. 71)." It has been the practice of the Government in the past to perform this service for other Government projects. The committee felt that since this service did exist it would be best to have the Capehart projects conform with this practice.

The Department of Defense, incidentally, estimates that this amendment will save the Government $6 million on the current 300 Capehart projects.

I recognize your great interest in this matter, and I want to thank you for bringing it to my attention. When the bill comes before the Senate I can assure you that I will raise this question with the committee on the Senate floor. The arguments of uniformity and even economy are not necessarily the conclusive ones, and I believe the matter deserves a full discussion.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

It seems to me this item calls for a legislative history on the floor. I am only asking for information, because if the allegation is true that this is going to work to the disadvantage of private concerns, I do not think we ought to adopt this type of provision. What we have been doing in regard to our military services is to get the military services out of private enterprise. That is why we have eliminated laundries and garages and whatnot in connection with many installations.

I have raised my point. I hope the Senators will answer.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Dakota to permit me to answer the question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this very question was completely covered in the debate this morning in answer to some very explicit questions, carefully phrased, which covered the points which are of concern to the Senator. Very strong assurance was given by several members of the committee that this provision was not intended at all as a precedent to apply to other so-called federally financed housing, for veterans or for any of the other programs.

The terms of the amendment are limited to the cases where the Government owns the land in question. The Government starts the program and leases the land, in effect, to a builder, guaranteeing the liens and everything else on the property, and in turn guarantees the payment of the mortgage, so it is a Government transaction from the beginning to the end. This does not apply to any other case.

Also, there have been cases where the Government has already acquired the property and evidently had title approval of the Attorney General or of someone else, which approval was accepted as being valid. The language proposed does not preclude the Attorney General himself from having the title checked by abstract companies or by lawyers. It does not set up any outside machinery or any new bureau. This is very narrowly limited.

There was a case, I believe, where $56,000 was spent on title insurance and record checks and everything for a Capehart housing unit at the new Air Force Academy, on land which had already been bought and was owned by the Government, with the title approved. At Fort Belvoir we had instances where some of the land had been owned for 100 years, but still a considerable amount of money was spent in this way.

This is a narrow gauge, limited amendment. I think the RECORD will already show a very satisfactory history for the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I am sorry I was not able to be present for the other discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish the Senator could have been present.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot be in committee meetings transacting business and still be in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator's remarks are very timely.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to have the judgment of the Senator from Mississippi that we are not establishing any precedent which will do injury to the title and abstract companies of the various States, as a general matter.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator is correct. I do not think this will be a precedent or will encroach on that field at all.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think it was well for the Senator from Oregon to bring up this matter. I am sorry the Senator was detained on other Senate business in the committees.

I have received several letters with regard to this subject, and since the discussion has been renewed, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Herbert A. Heidepriem, of Miller, S. Dak., and a letter from the Beemer Abstract Co., of Lake Andes, S. Dak., on this particular title problem.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEIDEPRIEM & WIDMAYER,
Miller, S. Dak., May 25, 1959.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANCIS: I am writing you relative to section 415 of H.R. 5674 which I understand is before a subcommittee of which you are a member which has to do with military housing.

I am told that this section provides that in the erection of Capehart housing projects that opinions on title will be furnished by the Attorney General's Office in lieu of abstracts or title insurance or any other type of title evidence. It appears that this is contained in the bill because a committee studying efficiency and economy in Government headed by Senator BYRD recommended it as a matter of economy to the Government.

However, there is some doubt as to whether more economy would result. The title industry feels that the cost to the Government would be as great, and that this means of handling the title matters is an unjustified intrusion into a field now competently cared for by private enterprise.

I do not have the evidence before me, so am unable to assess the situation. However, I am advised that you are being sent some information on the subject by Ernest Loebbecke, president of the American Title Association, from Los Angeles. Because this matter has come to my attention rather suddenly, I have not been able to obtain a copy of Mr. Loebbecke's information and consequently do not necessarily endorse what he has to say. I do ask, however, that you give it the careful scrutiny which is typical of your legislative activity.

Thanking you for your assistance in this matter, and with kindest personal regards to you and Mrs. Case, I am.

Yours very truly,

HERBERT A. HEIDEPRIEM.

BEEMER ABSTRACT CO.,
Lake Andes, S. Dak., May 25, 1959.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: It has come to my attention that a bill now in committee (House file No. 5674, sec. 415), will be brought on the floor this week. The bill is an amendment to the housing bill, and concerns the Capehart Housing Act. I believe that you are a member of the subcommittee.

The effect of this particular section, as I understand it, would be to substitute searches and findings by the Attorney General's Office for title guarantees made by title companies in the customary manner, thereby placing the Government in direct competition with the established title industry. This is a dangerous trend.

It is my conviction that this would be neither advisable nor economical. The title industry, over many years, has developed a system of title plants and trained personnel which is able to render efficient and accurate services. Their work is guaranteed as to accuracy. Persons unskilled in title work would not be able to render as prompt service, and there would be no guarantee against losses.

As to cost, it would seem that the rates of title companies are extremely reasonable. Should the title searches be performed by members of the Attorney General's staff, the time and expenses I am sure would greatly exceed the charges made by title companies.

I am asking Mr. Ernest Loebbecke, president of the American Title Association, to send you findings of that association which show that the title industry has rendered satisfactory service at reasonable charges in connection with the types of title involved.

This matter has doubtless already received your attention. The purpose of this letter is to call to your attention the fact that this bill, in its present form, would adversely affect title men throughout the United States, including every county in South Dakota.

I feel sure that we can rely upon your good judgment, and that you will continue to represent us in your proven satisfactory manner.

Yours very truly,

L. H. BEEMER.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like, for the RECORD and for the benefit of the Senator from Oregon, as well as for the benefit of the possible conferees on the bill, to suggest that when the bill goes to conference it might be well to check the language, to be sure the language does exactly what it is stated on the floor it will do.

If I correctly understood the Senator from Mississippi in his response to the Senator from Oregon, he said this was for projects where the property was owned by the United States. I am not sure the language in the bill says exactly that. I invite attention of Senators to the first sentence, line 9, page 51:

On request by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General shall furnish to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, an opinion as to the sufficiency of title to any property on which it is proposed to construct housing, or on which housing has been constructed, under this section.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it is intended that this language should deal only with property owned by the United States, I think it might be well—and I have so written on my copy of the bill—for us to consider the possibility of inserting, after the word "property," the words "owned by the United States," so that the language would read "to any property owned by the United States on which it is proposed to construct housing."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, my statement that this applied to property owned by the United States also referred to the fact that in the setting up of a Capehart project the first thing the Government does, if it does not own the land, is to buy the land. The starting point, in any event, is that the Government will own the land, either through ownership in years past or through recent acquisition. Therefore, it cannot go beyond the Capehart project being built on the Government land.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The other suggestion I made earlier in the day is one which I shall also renew at this point, for a continuity in the RECORD.

The last sentence of the paragraph reads:

None of the proceeds of any mortgage loan hereafter insured under such title VIII shall be used for title search and title insurance costs.

I am not a lawyer, but the language would seem to me to mean it would prevent any of the proceeds of any mortgage loan from being used for examining the title or for title insuranee costs, even though the Secretary of Defense had been advised by the Attorney General that there might be some imperfection in the title and the Secretary did not give the guarantee.

If the Secretary of Defense or the Attorney General finds some defect in the title, then it seems to me it might be appropriate for some of the proceeds of the mortgage loan to be used to continue the title search and to get some insurance on the title.

I suggested earlier that when the bill goes to conference, if further study by the technicians indicates it should be needed, we might add the words, "when the Secretary of Defense, on the opinion of the Attorney General, has made such a guarantee."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to join with the Senator from South Dakota in that suggestion.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi would not object, if the Senator will yield, to some language along that line. However, if the Secretary of Defense does not certify and guarantee the loan, the whole project stops at that point anyway. I think we can work out language to cover the situation.

Mr. MORSE. Is it understood that I may have printed in the RECORD communications which I have received from Oregon similar to those offered by the Senator from South Dakota? I ask unanimous consent that I may do so, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURNS, OREG.,
June 2, 1959.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

H.R. 5674, section 415D contains material which allows the Government to guarantee land titles. This is not warranted since private industry adequately provides this service. Passage of this section will jeopardize the stability of all the title guarantee companies in the Nation. We request that you do everything in your power to effect elimination of section 415D from H.R. 5674.

HARNEY COUNTY ABSTRACT & TITLE CO.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
June 2, 1959.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

It has come to our attention that section 415D of H.R. 5674 provides that the U.S. Attorney General will furnish opinions as to the sufficiency of the land title to the Capehart housing projects so that the Secretary of Defense may then guarantee the title on such property, thereby eliminating the need for private title service. We feel that insuring and evidencing of titles are best performed by private business and that section 415D of H.R. 5674 clearly places the U.S. Government in the title insurance industry and in direct competition to private enterprise.

BUDD G. BURNIE,
President, Pacific Title Insurance Co.

PENDLETON, OREG., *June 2, 1959.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our attention has been drawn to H.R. 5674, sec. 415d which we belicve to be a usurpation of the function of private industry by the Government which would ultimately be detrimental to both. We urge your opposition to this legislation.

JOHN D. LOGAN,
Chief Title Officer, Oregon Title Insurance Co.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 2, 1959.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

It has come to our attention that section 415d of H.R. 5674 provides that the U.S. Attorney General will furnish opinions at to the sufficiency of the land title to the Capehart housing projects so that the Secretary of Defense may then guarantee the title on such property thereby eliminating the need for private title service. We feel that insuring and evidencing of titles are best performed by private business and that section 415d of H.R. 5674 clearly places the U.S. Government in the title insurance industry and in direct competition to private enterprise.

JOHN M. SMEATON,
Vice President, Pacific Title Insurance Co.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in concluding my statement, I recognize, of course, that if the Secretary did not certify the project it would not proceed, but it does seem to me it would be desirable to make it possible for the project to proceed by utilizing some proceeds of the mortgage loan, if that were necessary, to get the title in shape.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, some communications I have received on this subject.

There being no objection, the letters and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *May 26, 1959.*

Hon. HOMER CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Sectlon 415 add to H.R. 5674 by Senate committee unrealistic. Title insurance provides essential service Capehart projects at less cost than Government can render equivalent service. Senate amendment is another encroachment in field of private business. Unalterably opposed to amendment.

L. M. BROWN TITLE CO., INC.,
RUSSELL A. FURR, *President.*

THE AMERICAN TITLE ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 27, 1959.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I am writing you as president of the American Title Association on a matter of the utmost importance. Our members are located in practically every county of the United States.

The Subcommittee on Military Housing, under the chairmanship of Senator JOHN STENNIS, has added section 415 to H.R. 5674. The effect of section 415 will be to place the U.S. Government in competition with the title insurance industry. We believe that this section is not in the best interests of the Federal Government or the public, nor will it result in lower costs.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of my letter and supporting data sent the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, of California. This same material has been sent to Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL. I believe this material will substantiate our position and I hope that someone of your staff will have the time to read this material in order to familiarize you with the basic problem and our position in this matter.

It is my understanding that H.R. 5674 has been reported to the Senate under Senate Report No. 296 to be considered sometime next week. Our industry strongly urges your support in having section 415, or any substitute therefor which would have the effect of placing the Government in competition with private industry, eliminated from this bill.

Very truly yours,
ERNEST J. LOEBBECKE,
President.

MAY 19, 1959.

The Honorable CLAIR ENGLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention of Mr. Cikins.)

DEAR SENATOR ENGLE: This letter is written in connection with my telephone conversation with your office this morning and deals with the matter of title insurance on Capehart housing projects. For your information I am enclosing a copy of a report made to Mr. Robert Dechert, Chief Counsel of the Department of Defense; a letter to Mr. Dechert concerning charges for title insurance on Capehart housing projects; a copy of section 415, which has been added to H.R. 5674

by the Senate committee; and a copy of Committee Print No. 2, dated May 15, 1959.

This amendment to H.R. 5674 is apparently the result of an investigation by the General Accounting Office and their conclusion that title insurance and services of title companies are not necessary in conjunction with the Capehart housing projects. They base their conclusion on the fact that the land is Government owned and, therefore, it would be proper for the Attorney General's Office to render an opinion of title and for the Department of Defense to guarantee the mortgages.

From the material, which I enclose, I believe you will agree with me that this is an oversimplification of the problem. While it is true that the United States has title to the land, it should be remembered that the Capehart program was instituted as a substitute for the Wherry Act housing program and was designed to encourage private financing of military housing.

The loans are actually secured by a leasehold. In some instances the land is acquired specifically for the Capehart project and there have been occasions when the title insurance companies have found that the Government did not have good title to the land on which the project was to be built. We realize that the Federal Government has the power to correct any such deficiency that may occur. However, until such deficiency is corrected the leasehold thereon is impaired and the loan made by the interim lender is not, in fact, a good loan. Even where the title to the land is good, if the leasing corporation, which builds the improvements, has not been properly instituted, or has not taken all necessary steps to execute the lease, then again a defect would exist in the lease which is security for the mortgage. During the course of construction there are matters that can affect the lessee and the rights of the interim lender. All of these matters are covered by title insurance and by the services performed by the title companies, thus insuring the interim lender that when the project is finished he has a good loan which can be readily transferred to a permanent lender. The permanent lender is either the Federal National Mortgage Association or a private lending institution.

We recognize that after the project is completed and all intervening matters have been taken care of and the loan transferred to the permanent lender a guarantee by the Department of Defense in lieu of title insurance would probably be satisfactory. However, this is not true of the interim lender and one of the important factors that would be missing insofar as either the interim lender or the permanent lender are concerned and also insofar as the Government is concerned is the fact that where title insurance is used the title insurer will undertake the defense of any matters insured against in the policy.

The Department of Justice, which handles land acquisitions, does a good job and is capable of rendering opinions of title. However, they do not have staff available to make the search of title, and from our discussions with them it is obvious that if this amendment is adopted the Government will have to create either in the Attorney General's Office—or someplace else—a staff of people whose job it will be to go to the area where the Capehart housing project is to be built and make an examination of all of the public records to cover not only the acquisition of the land by the Federal Government, but also all of the other matters that are presently covered by the title companies during the course of construction and through the time the mortgage is transferred to the permanent lender.

The title industry is made up of title experts throughout the United States. Its members are located in practically each county of every State. It seems obvious that the services that should be performed in conjunction with a Capehart project can be better and more cheaply handled by the title industry than by the Federal Government. We are particularly concerned because this is, in our judgment, an encroachment into the field of private industry. I do not believe that it is unreasonable to assume that if a department is created to search and examine titles in conjunction with Capeharts that it would not be long before pressure was exerted to extend this to FHA- and VA-insured loans.

In the light of this, it seems to us in the title industry that section 415 should be stricken from H.R. 5674, for it puts the Government into competition with private enterprise. We believe that the title industry has recognized that a reduction in cost was warranted, as has been indicated by my letter to Mr. Dechert on this subject.

In closing, I want to again point out that the last sentence of proposed section 415 will mean that there will be no search of the records on which the Attorney General can give an opinion and that the funds will have to come from some place to pay the cost of providing that information.

I appreciate very much your interest in this matter and believe that title insurance is the most feasible method of handling title problems in conjunction with the Capehart housing projects and is in the best interest of the Government, the public, and the private investor. It is my hope that section 415 can be eliminated from H.R. 5674.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST J. LOEBBECKE,
President, American Title Association.

MEMORANDUM

From: American Title Association.

To: Mr. Robert Dechert, Chief Counsel, Department of Defense.

Subject: Title insurance on Capehart housing projects.

I. STATEMENT OF THE QUESTION

The construction of military housing under the so-called Capehart program as authorized by the Congress (Public Law 345, 84th Cong. and amendments) was designed as a substitute for the construction of housing with funds appropriated from the Treasury. Instead of the appropriated-fund method with resulting budgeting of large capital expenditures, the Capehart program invites the cooperation of private industry and private financing under a procedure whereby Government owned land is leased for a nominal sum to a private builder who agrees to construct thereon housing in accordance with Government requirements and specifications. The cost and expense of construction is to be arranged by the builder through private financing sources and is to be secured by an FHA insured mortgage on the builder's leasehold estate. Under the authorized procedure, the builder agrees that as housing units are completed they will be turned over to the control of the interested service and that upon completion of construction the ownership of the lessee-mortgagor corporation will pass to the Department of Defense by a transfer of the capital stock of such corporation.

To encourage the participation of private capital and since the Government is to become the owner of the lessee-mortgagor corporation upon completion of construction and is in direct control of the extent to which the project will or might derive revenues through occupancy, the Government, and rightly so, guarantees to the mortgagee that commencing with its ownership the payments on the mortgage debt will be thereafter paid as they become due. As an inducement to participation in the program, the private builder receives all of his costs and estimated profit from the proceeds of the loan that will be insured by FHA and ultimately repaid by the Government. One of these items is the cost of title insurance provided by the builder to assure the mortgagee and the FHA that the mortgage constitutes a valid first lien on a marketable title to a valid leasehold estate free of prior liens, encumbrances or defects of title.

It has been proposed that a form of Government guaranty (a new concept of title evidence) be substituted for the standard form of title evidence now provided for by Government regulation.

The question is whether such substitution would in fact result in (a) less cost to the public and (b) furthering the purposes of the program by providing the service and protection required by private lenders, to the degree that such service and protection is now provided by the use of title insurance.

II. PRESENT METHOD OF EVIDENCING TITLE UNDER EXISTING LAW

A. Procedure

The present method of evidencing title is by means of a title insurance policy of a qualified private insurance company. Unlike fire and other forms of insurance, mortgagee title insurance is a single premium insurance that remains in full force and effect so long as any part of the mortgage debt remains unpaid. Its issuance as related to a Capehart transaction encompasses the following:

(1) Preparation of a title search of all available public records and responsibility therefor from the time the property originally became a part of the United States down to date.

(2) Examination of the title search by a qualified attorney.

(3) Examination of surveys for accuracy and sufficiency.

(4) Examination of plot plans for encroachments of improvements on to easements or outside the lines of the leased areas.

(5) Examination for sufficiency of corporate proceedings and resolutions of the mortgagor-builder corporation.

(6) Examination and investigation to determine due execution, sufficiency, and delivery of all documents in the transaction.

(7) Periodic examination of the public records during the course of construction to show the condition of title at the date of each disbursement as disbursements are made.

(8) In most cases attend the preliminary and final closings for the purposes of resolving title questions and arranging for the recording of all documents.

(9) Negotiate with all interested departments, agencies, and parties, as to the form of the title policy and the propriety or validity of any exception shown.

B. Effect of present procedure

Title insurance policies provide to the governmental agencies, investors and others interested a form of title evidence acceptable to investors. The bases of this acceptability are as follows:

1. Service: The utilization of the services of a title insurer accelerates the time at which the project may be commenced and makes possible the discovering and overcoming of title problems which might later arise to give trouble to all parties concerned. We do not know of a single instance in which a closing was delayed because the title insurer was not ready with evidence of title, and it should be remembered that in all instances the armed service and the builder are anxious to proceed with the least possible delay after issuance of the letter of acceptability. As an example of one instance, that of Fort Campbell, involving property in Tennessee and Kentucky, one of our members through the utilization of the time and personnel of its home office, Washington office, Louisville, Ky., office, Dallas

office, and associated practicing attorneys in Kentucky and Tennessee, received the order for the title evidence on a Friday; the titles had been examined and interim binders were prepared and in the mail in a form acceptable to the mortgagee, FHA, Department of the Army, and others by Thursday night of the following week. We do not believe that such service can be matched by any other procedure.

In our experience with Capehart projects we have had instances where the Government, contrary to its belief, did not have title to all the land proposed to be leased, instances where the Government had acquired title by purchase and the title so acquired was subject to material outstanding defects, and instances where the Government had acquired title by condemnation subject to general exceptions to easements without knowledge that the proposed project area was traversed by outstanding easement grants of record. In another instance one of our members discovered that the areas surveyed and proposed to be leased for a Capehart project overlapped upon an existing Wherry project. The timely discovery and report of matters of these types has prevented subsequent trouble of a substantial nature and has enabled the closing to proceed on schedule.

In practice, the title insurer at its own cost and expense acts as a clearinghouse for the receipt and dissemination of information for the benefit of all interested parties in the preparations leading up to the initial closing. Through the availability of its facilities in the various States and through its familiarity with the laws thereof the title insurer is able to provide valuable assistance and information not only to the mortgagee but also to the builder and to the interested Service.

As a part of the title insurer's service, it has a representative at the initial closing and at the final closing of each unit in the project after completion of such unit. Such representative passes upon the sufficiency of form, content, and execution of all documents required to establish the leasehold estate and the validity and priority of the mortgage lien. He supervises the transportation of the documents to his representative at the county seat who continues the title check, records the papers and reports by telephone to the closing so that it can be carried to completion and the title policies delivered.

During the period of construction, the title insurer furnishes the mortgagee with title continuation reports and title policy endorsements at the time of each disbursement.

Because of the short period of time allowed in the closing of these cases between the issuance to the builder of the letter of acceptability and the closing date required by the armed service, it not infrequently happens that the armed service does not receive the final survey and cannot prepare the final lease description until just before the closing and neither the mortgagee nor the FHA nor the title insurer see the description and survey until the day of the closing. The title insurer must approve description and survey and the other interested parties rely on that approval. Not infrequently errors of description or survey are caught at the closing in time to prevent the recordation of leases and mortgages with erroneous descriptions.

2. Mechanics' and materialmen's lien coverage: It is the practice for construction and permanent lenders to require the title insurer to protect against loss because of mechanics' and materialmen's liens including all litigation expense resulting therefrom in addition to any payment and performance bonds that are required. The coverage provided by the title insurer in this respect is broader than that of the payment and performance bonds, and the added coverage is not available to the mortgagee by any other means. The bonds required, at costs far in excess of the cost of title insurance, by no means protect against all possible claimants, have not been interpreted by the courts and provide no protection as to marketability during the course of mechanics' lien litigation. In some cases where a claim is asserted on these types of bonds there can be a valid question as to whether or not there is liability on the bonds. This may result in costly negotiation or litigation on the part of the lender or the Federal Housing Commissioner which is obviated when the lender and the Commissioner also have title insurance protection.

3. Possessory and survey coverages: Lenders require and the present law provides that the title insurance policy afford coverage as follows: that the leased premises as located on the ground be within the title lines of the United States; that the improvements be within the leased premises and not encroach onto other lands of the Government or onto private lands; and that the improvements not encroach onto easements. In this respect the title insurer has discovered that the engineer's description does not always conform to the facts on the ground or of record and has obtained corrected descriptions.

4. Marketability of the loan: One of the factors that has increased the effectiveness of the program has been the acceptability of the loans. When the validity and priority of the lien of the mortgage on the leasehold estate are supported by a standard title insurance policy of a responsible title insurance company, so far as title is concerned, the loan has been readily acceptable to any institutional investor whether it be the construction or the permanent lender, or a subsequent assignee from the permanent lender, and whether the institutional investor is located in the community where the property might be situated or on the opposite side of the country from the situs of the project. This fact alone materially aids the attractiveness of the investment to the institutional lender. It should also be noted that various pension trusts furnish financing for Capehart projects. Some of these trusts are controlled by private contracts or agreements which, in many cases, specify the types of real estate investments that may be made by the trustees and the form of title evidence required. These trusts uniformly accept and generally require title insurance. If title insurance is not provided such trusts might be eliminated as potential lenders on Capehart projects.

5. Responsibility and responsiveness of title insurers: Title insurers are required by law and in their interests do respond promptly when any claim is asserted against which they have insured. The title companies have experts on their staffs to handle claims as well as title experts who work on the matters incident to the issuance of their policies.

III. PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE FOR TITLE INSURANCE

The proposal is that a method be set up for the Office of the Attorney General to furnish a basis for the Secretary of Defense to indemnify the mortgagee with respect to any loss sustained by reason of adverse claims against the title.

It is inconceivable that the Government would undertake to guarantee title without knowing its status. To effectively give the same protection now afforded to mortgagees under a title insurance policy it would be necessary for some branch of the Government to perform or to procure the services presently rendered by title insurers, which services are listed under II–a above. Many of the areas proposed for Capehart development are currently acquired by the Government and where the Government has had title for some years many instances are encountered in which the Government did not in fact know the status of its own title or its evidences of title were lost or were in inaccessible storage or where various departments of the Government had created outstanding rights in third parties by grants or licenses.

1. Comparative service: The Government lacks the experienced and qualified personnel and the adequate countrywide title facilities available to the title insurer and could not possibly perform the necessary title functions with the speed and the decision such as has been rendered by the title insurer. These deficiencies will necessarily result in delays that will be detrimental to the program. These same deficiencies would necessarily pertain to the handling by the Government, efficiently and economically, of claims against the title.

We again point out that the title industry has available on a nationwide basis trained experts in the field of title searching and examining and in the handling of title claims.

In the matter of claims there may be both valid and invalid claims. The valid claims must be paid promptly and all claims must nevertheless be defended and disposed of without cost or damage to the mortgagee.

2. Comparative costs: Although the rates vary in different sections of the country, generally in the absence of State regulation requiring different rates for premium computations in a particular section, the title insurance premium, which includes all costs of the title insurer and, in these Capehart projects, the cost of title examination, is usually less than one-quarter of 1 percent of the amount of the loan. In fact, as the size of the loan increases the cost percentagewise is appreciably lower and in most instances is less than one-sixth of 1 percent. Any attempt to handle these cases titlewise, could not be accomplished as expeditiously or at less cost by the proposed procedure.

3. Policy consideration: A program of the suggested type would be a distinct departure from the Government's traditional attitude. Traditionally the Federal Government has never warranted the sufficiency of the title to any land owned or sold by the Government. The suggestion which has been made, if carried out, would result in the Federal Government entering into the title insurance field in competition with private industry. It would require either (a) the creation of a substantial staff of trained personnel to perform all of the duties now being performed by the title industry, or (b) the handling of title insurance on these projects on a casualty insurance basis. This would clearly and unequivocally be an encroachment by the Federal Government into the business field and would be in contravention of the express policy of the present administration and of the Congress.

The result of such encroachment would not be to the best interests of the public. As has been indicated, if all of the srvices now performed by the title industry were furnished by Government, the cost of such services would be greater, not less than the present costs. If the Government chose to handle the guarantee of these titles without adequate staff and without any examination of title or evaluation of the risks being assumed, the immediate cost might be less, but in the long run the risks assumed would unquestionably result in far greater costs than at present. In addition, the Government has no right, fundamentally, to create future liabilities by such a procedure. Further, if the suggestion is followed, there is no doubt that many lenders would hesitate to participate in a program that would place them in the awkward position of having a possible dispute with the Government, the debtor, on a title claim. Conversely, the Government might be embarrased to expend funds in defense of a title which would re-

sult in an increase in the Government's debt on that particular Capehart project.

In setting up the Capehart program, it was the intent of Congress to enlist the aid of private industry in providing military housing. The purpose of this memorandum is to establish the fact that when housing is created under the Capehart program, title insurance is the most feasible method of handling title problems and is in the best interest of the Government, the private investor, and the public.

AMERICAN TITLE ASSOCIATION,
ERNEST J. LOEBBECKE, *President.*
GEORGE C. RAWLINGS, *Chairman.*
A. E. PETERSON,
C. J. MCCONVILLE,
WILLIAM H. BAKER, Jr.,
RICHARD H. HOWLETT,
Committee on Title Insurance on Capehart Housing Projects.

TITLE INSURANCE AND TRUST CO.,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 12, 1959.

Mr. ROBERT DECHERT,
Chief Counsel, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DECHERT: During our conference last week when I presented you a memorandum on behalf of the American Title Association on the subject of title insurance on Capehart housing projects, I promised to advise you what the situation is in my own company in regard to charges. The following sets forth what has been done by Title Insurance and Trust Co. and its subsidiaries in this regard.

Under the Capehart housing program, this company has participated in the insuring of the construction lender and the transfer of the paper after completion both as a direct insurer and as a reinsurer. Our first contact with the program was as a reinsurer and we were not advised as to the method of bidding nor the actual coverage that were expected by the lenders.

In the latter part of 1957, this company, as a direct insurer, was requested and we did issue policies covering three Capehart projects in California. In each of those cases we discussed with the lender the coverages that the lender required and we discussed with the FHA its requirements as to title evidence. The charge that was made was based upon our then effective schedule covering the issuance of an ATA policy upon the recording of the construction loan on the leasehold, monthly date downs, and the issuance of an ATA policy with 100 endorsement upon the completion of the project for all three of those services. In addition, a service charge was made for monthly reports as to mechanic liens. These charges under the schedule for an aggregate loan of $5 million in the Los Angeles area were approximately $14,203.

After a review of the early projects and an analysis of the risks and services to be performed, the Company decided that the charge on the Capehart loans could be reduced. It was felt that because of the fact that we had to use our most experienced attorneys in handling the closing of the transaction at the time the loan was recorded and in handling the phase out of the project upon completion that we were justified, if all of the expenses of the closing were absorbed in the premium charged for the policy, to continue making rather a substantial charge; however, we did feel that because of the substantially smaller risk assumed in this type of policy a lesser charge for a single ATA policy of title insurance would be proper. Effective July 7, 1958 our published schedule of rates was amended to permit this reduction on policies issued on Capehart loans. In Los Angeles County under this new schedule, the fee on a $5 million Capehart is $7,608.75. No additional charge is made for closing costs other than recording fees and no additional charge is made for the monthly mechanic lien date downs.

Similar revisions of schedules applicable to our branches and subsidiaries outside of Los Angeles County were adopted at about the same time.

While each title insurer sets its own rates, except in those areas which have state regulation of rates, because of the competition in bidding on Capehart projects, it is our understanding that other title insurers have also reduced their rates on these projects.

Very truly yours,
ERNEST J. LOEBBECKE,
President.

H.R. 5674

An Act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes

SEC. 415. Section 403 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) On request by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General shall furnish to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, an opinion as to the sufficiency of title to any property on which it is proposed to construct housing, or on which housing has been constructed, under this section. If the opinion of the Attorney General is that the title to any such property is good and sufficient, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to guarantee, or enter into a commitment to guarantee, the mortgages, under a mortgage on such property which is insured under title VIII of the National Housing Act, against any losses that may thereafter arise from adverse claims to title. None of the proceeds of any mortgage loan hereafter insured under such title VIII shall be used for title search and title insurance costs."

COMMITTEE PRINT NO. 2, MAY 15, 1959—
REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 5674

Section 415: The purpose of this section is to eliminate the practice of purchasing title search and insurance for Capehart housing projects built on property owned by the Government. The provision will require this service to be performed by the Department of Justice as it is on all other Government property; authorize the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the mortgages in all respects and prohibit the use of mortgage funds for the payment of fees for title search and inurance.

THE AMERICAN TITLE ASSOCIATION,
June 11, 1959.

Mr. JOHN HANCOCK,
Care of Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANCOCK: When I was in your office on May 28, I was on my way to Dallas, Tex., and this is the first opportunity I have had to write to express my appreciation for the courtesy shown me by you and Senator CAPEHART.

It is apparent from the reaction of some of the Senators that they fail to realize the basic factors in section 415.

The enclosed copy of my letter to Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON sets forth in as concise way as possible the real facts concerning the basic issues.

I would appreciate your reviewing the enclosed letter and placing the information before Senator CAPEHART for his information.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE C. RAWLINGS,
Chairman, Title Insurance Section.

THE AMERICAN TITLE ASSOCIATION,
June 11, 1959.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Mr. Charles C. Hampton, president, Texas Title Association, Dallas, Tex., has forwarded to me a copy of your letter to him dated June 4, 1959.

An erroneous impression has been created to the effect that the Attorney General is only permitted by section 415 of H.R. 5674 to perform the function customarily done on other Government real estate transactions. The fact is:

The Attorney General, nor any other Governmental department, has ever performed the function permitted under section 415. It has been common practice for the Attorney General to pass on the sufficiency of titles to land acquired by the Government where the improvements to be erected are paid for out of appropriated funds. There is a vast differences between this and the Attorney General, together with the Department of Defense undertaking to guarantee to a private investor the validity and priority of a mortgage lien merely because the security for the loan is a lease arising out of Government owned land. This latter practice has never been followed and is not permitted by law which accounts for section 415.

The cost element of title insurance has been grossly exaggerated in some quarters.

From one source, it is stated that the Government will save $6 million by eliminating title insurance. Another source states that the Government will save millions. The facts are:

Page 23 of the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee, dated May 15, 1959, states as of April 20, 1959, total cost of 72,713 Capehart units completed and under construction as $1,186,725,150. The total title insurance cost on the aggregate amount should not have exceeded $1,750,000. This is fait accompli and not affected by section 415. No further charge is to be made.

Section 412 of the bill limits the number of Capehart units to 21,500 for the fiscal year 1960. This limitation may or may not be approved, but it is a fair basis for estimating title insurance costs in the future. 21,500 units at the maximum amount of $16,500 per unit is an aggregate amount of $354,750,000. The title insurance cost will not exceed $550,000. The cost for title insurance has not in the past nor will the cost in the future, exceed $25 per unit.

Even though the fanciful theory suggested in the Comptroller General's report that the charges for title insurance would be doubled on account of the amount being included in the mortgage loan does not justify the estimated cost of millions for title insurance—why apply this theory to only title insurance charges? The same thing is true of construction cost and all services included in the mortgage loan.

The statement to the effect that section 415 will save the Government millions of dollars is fantastic. The bare truth is the services that will have to be performed by Government departments will result in the cost to the taxpayers being more rather than less. Private business can and will perform the services at less cost, including a reasonable profit on which 52 percent income tax is paid, than can Government departments.

There are many other disturbing elements indicated in the proposal contained in Section 415, but the basic factors are:

1. It requires the Departments of Defense and Justice to perform services and to invade a field not now permitted or authorized by statute to the detriment of private business.

2. The cost to the taxpayers in additional expense to governmental departments in-

volved will exceed the amount paid private business.

3. It is a further invasion by Government into the legitimate field of private, tax-paying enterprise, without beneficial results.

These basic factors are presented for your consideration before casting your vote on Section 415.

Sincerely,

GEORGE C. RAWLINGS,
Chairman, Title Insurance Section.

RICHMOND, VA., *May 28, 1959.*

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Received telegram of 27th. My views known to Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON. Will be at your office today 2 p.m. Hope you will be available for a few minutes.

GEORGE C. RAWLINGS,
President, Lawyers Title Insurance Corp.

MAY 27, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE C. RAWLINGS,
President, Lawyers Title Insurance Corp., Richmond, Va.:

Received your letter of May 26. Thanks. Suggest you make known your views to Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON as soon as possible. This legislation expected to be pending business on Senate floor Thursday, May 28.

HOMER E. CAPEHART.

LAWYERS TITLE INSURANCE CORP.,
Richmond, Va., May 26, 1959.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
U. S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Enclosed is copy of a memorandum from the American Title Association to Robert Dechert, General Counsel, Department of Defense, and a copy of letter from the president of the American Title Association to Senator ENGLE. The information contained in the memorandum and letter will give you in detail the position of the title insurance industry with respect to section 415 that has been inserted in H.R. 5674 by the Senate committee. I should like to emphasize two points:

1. It is proposed in section 415 that the Attorney General shall furnish to the Secretary of Defense an opinion as to the sufficiency of title. This will require that an examination of the title be made, as various title insurance companies have found on previous Capehart transactions handled many instances in which the Government did not, in fact, know the status of its own title, or where various Departments of the Government had created outstanding rights in third parties by grants or licenses. In addition to the examination of the title, there are many other services that a department of the Government would have to furnish that are now being furnished by the title insurance companies; and the net result will be that the cost to the taxpayer will not be less and probably will exceed the reasonable charge made by title insurance companies.

2. The proposal as contained in section 415 is another step in the Government invading the field of private business. Historically, the Government in disposing of lands has only conveyed by quitclaim deed without warranty of any kind. Now, at one jump, it proposed to engage in the title insurance business by guaranteeing title in every respect. It is disturbing to contemplate what the next step may be.

The adoption by Congress of section 415 of H.R. 5674 will be a disservice to the military housing program and to the taxpayer.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE C. RAWLINGS,
President.

(See above-mentioned letter to Senator ENGLE, and memorandum to Mr. Robert Dechert following the letter to Senator CAPEHART.)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment to extend the Housing Act with respect to the title which covers the Capehart housing program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the military construction authorization bill now pending before the Senate which corrects what I call a technical error in the bill. I have conferred with the chairman of the subcommittee and he is agreeable to the amendment.

The amendment refers to line 2 on page 47 of the bill and will insert the words "now Fort Jackson" after reference to Camp Jackson. The purpose of my amendment is to clearly show to anyone reading this bill or referring to this authorization that the Camp Jackson referred to in the bill is Fort Jackson, a permanent installation. Camp Jackson was officially designated a fort on March 21, 1956, by the Department of the Army; however, the first reference to this medical facility came in the authorization act of July 15, 1955, preceding the designation of the installation as a fort. Therefore, subsequent references have been to Camp Jackson rather than to Fort Jackson.

My amendment simply reaffirms the fact that Fort Jackson is a permanent installation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 47, line 2, after the words "Camp Jackson" it is proposed to insert the words "(now Fort Jackson)".

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from South Carolina has rendered a service in detecting this matter and in correcting it. I join with him in asking that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I detected in the bill that the words "Camp Jackson" were used, instead of "Fort Jackson," and I spoke to one of the staff members of the Committee on Armed Services about it. I was informed it would make no difference, since the original act provided for Camp Jackson, but I would feel better to have it listed as Fort Jackson, because in 1956 the fort was placed back on the list of permanent stations.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. The correct name is "Fort Jackson." The Post Office address is Fort Jackson. That is the way I think we should refer to it.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that an outstanding American has come to the close of a brilliant career of public service to our country. I refer, of course, to the distinguished Gen. Maxwell Davenport Taylor, who this afternoon at Fort Myer takes his final salute as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, culminating nearly 41 years in the uniform of his country. General Taylor's service has been one of dedicated and selfless devotion—in peace and war—to the security and defense of the United States. His soldierly accomplishments and contributions to this cause have won for him a place of first rank among the great captains of our military history. But General Taylor has proved himself far more than a soldier and commander. He has won acclaim as a thoughtful scholar, and as a military statesman possessed of penetrating insight into the complexities of international relations and politico-military matters in the tense world in which we live today.

General Taylor has truly earned the respect and esteem of the Congress and the people of the United States—indeed, the people of all the free world. Therefore, I believe it fitting at this time that as General Taylor's official career comes to a close we should pay tribute to this outstanding gentleman, who occupies an important place in the history of our times.

Maxwell D. Taylor was born in Keytesville, Mo., August 26, 1901. Following attendance at Northeast High School and Kansas City Junior College, Missouri, he entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1918. On graduation, he stood No. 4 in the class of 1922, and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers.

General Taylor entered the Army at a time when it was in the final throes of its decline following World War I. The world had been made safe for democracy and war was never to happen again. Although the view of the years ahead as a career officer was one which might have discouraged many lesser men, he entered upon it with enthusiasm, determination, and a zeal for seeking the farthest horizons of knowledge.

In the lean years of peacetime service in the skeletonized Regular Army, Maxwell Taylor laid the foundations of his global perspective and military competence.

As a young officer, he served in Hawaii, the Far East, Europe, and Latin America.

with the respect and esteem of every Member of this body.

In his address before the National Press Club last week he gave one of the most stimulating summaries of military judgment that has been presented to the country for some time. I hope it will receive wide reading, and that we may continue to have the benefit of General Taylor's mature and well considered opinions on our national defense problems.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Senators are waiting to vote. Some are compelled to leave the city. I do not wish to rush any Senator or cut off anyone. We have a very few amendments. Unless some extraneous matters intervene, I believe that we can dispose of the amendments in a few minutes, and then have the yeas and nays ordered on the passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk which has as its purpose the substitution of an armory at the Martindale Army Air Field, Tex., in the amount of $210,000, in lieu of one authorized for Houston No. 1, Tex., in the 1959 military construction authorization bill in the amount of $323,000. This is a substitution requested by the State Adjutant General with the approval of the National Guard Bureau and is, in fact, a savings to the Government of $113,000.

This is in keeping with the formula followed by the committee in considering armory construction.

The committee added no new armories to the bill, but did agree that if the State Adjutant Generals and the National Guard Bureau desired to substitute one armory for another, as long as there was no increase in price, the committee would accept such substitutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 70, between lines 10 and 11, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

Houston Number 1, Texas: Training facilities, $323,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 55, between lines 12 and 13, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 419. In carrying out any project authorized by the foregoing provisions of this Act in a foreign country, currencies of such country acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress) shall, to the extent available, and feasible, be used in lieu of dollars. The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation from appropriations made pursuant to authorizations contained in this Act for the dollar value of foreign currencies used as provided in this section.

On page 55, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 419" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 420".

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this amendment is the one which was discussed earlier. It merely provides for a broadening of Public Law 480, so far as military construction is concerned, by using the proceeds from surplus commodities. Public Law 480 now applies to schoolhouses, farm housing, and items of that nature. This amendment proposes to broaden it whenever it is feasible. We shall be glad to take the amendment to conference and see what we can do with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make in connection with the bill. I have been in conference all afternoon.

First, I want to express my admiration for the members of the Military Construction Subcommittee who, under the most able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, and the very able senior minority member, Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota, can always be counted upon to do a most thorough and dedicated job.

This is not an easy bill to handle and the issues involved have far-reaching impact on our national defense structure. It has never been handled lightly. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman, Senator STENNIS, a few questions to clarify the record, for I know he has an intimate knowledge of the subject possessed by few.

As indicated earlier today, am I not correct in stating that the committee action now reflects the so-called revised plan submitted by the Secretary of Defense, and that it was the committee's initial intention not necessarily to point out weapons systems which should be expanded or deleted, but rather to insist that the Department of Defense properly review the subject and make decisions?

Mr. STENNIS. The immediate concern was to obtain a review, and then a decision. The revised plan, to a degree, was in part, at least, such a decision and such a revision. We adopted it and put it in the bill. However, we want continued surveillance and continued reexamination and appraisal. We were not trying to select military weapons, but, after all, there is a matter of policy involved. There is not enough money to go around, and someone must make the decision as to how much money should go into various projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Am I correct in believing that this plan does not then really deny either the Nike system or the Bomarc system, but requires the Secretary of Defense and his senior military advisers, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to make the decisions and forward their recommendations to Congress?

Mr. STENNIS. It is another attempt to obtain more clear-cut decisions on these questions, and a reevaluation of the various systems of defense. We have not yet had a clear-cut, unanimous opinion from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is one other area I would like to mention briefly, and that is military family housing. I know the Subcommitee and the Armed Service Committee, of which I am a member, has for some time now thoroughly reviewed the military family housing picture with three objectives in mind: First, to insure that our people in uniform have adequate housing; second, to insure, of course, that this housing is provided on the most economical basis; and third, that maximum dependence is placed on the local communities to provide rental housing.

Would the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee care to comment on this?

Mr. STENNIS. Generally speaking, that is in keeping with the policy of the committee. We have believed for a long time that the Government got more for its money under the system of appropriated funds. We have also thought that there was a limit to the percentage of eligible personnel to whom we could furnish housing. The military has made a real effort to arrive at an equitable plan, and we have insisted upon giving proper consideration to local conditions, and utilizing local housing when available.

While, for emergency reasons we have just extended the Capehart housing program for another year, the entire matter ought to be brought under complete review before it is extended again.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In furtherance of the subject, is it the committee's intent to survey continually the needs of the military for family housing units and to insist that the Department of Defense continuously review and bring up to date even the numbers of units now being authorized in this bill?

Mr. STENNIS. Oh, yes. That is certainly one of our requirements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It seems that such would be most essential and necessary in order to insure that the three previously mentioned objectives are accomplished, for certainly while we want to provide the military with the facilities, it must not be construed as the intent of Congress either to overproduce military family housing or to completely upset the local communities where such facilities are being established.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and join with many others of my colleagues in expressing our compliments to him, to his associate, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and to the entire subcommittee members for their most thorough and expert consideration of a very difficult piece of legislation.

Mr. President, as originally presented to Congress by the Department of Defense, with the approval of the President, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1960 included a request for a taxiway-runway access at Hickam Air Force Base in the amount of $1,299,000.

This request was deleted by House action and the Senate Armed Service Committee also omitted the item because of lack of adequate testimony.

The Armed Services Committee is now in receipt of a letter, signed by the Secretary of the Air Force, indicating the current and future need for this facility.

Secretary Douglas says:

With construction of the new Honolulu Air Terminal Complex, operation of Air Force functions will depend on this taxiway to provide a ground movement return to Hickam Air Force Base. This project will provide greater ease of access to the runway system and shorter taxiway distance. Long, time-consuming waits are experienced in getting to parking areas. This is extremely costly in wasted man-hours and increased fuel consumption. In addition, Hickam is a major terminal and a parallel taxiway connecting to each runway is an important part of any major airport.

The Air Force considers this to be a very important project.

Mr. President, because the Air Force has now indicated its operational requirement for the facility, I shall propose an amendment to the bill under consideration, providing the necessary authorization. With the approval of the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I offer the amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 34, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

Hickman Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, operational facilities, $1,299,000.

On page 42, line 8, strike out "$71,759,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$73,058,000."

On page 42, line 10, strike out "$791,046,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$792,345,000."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, upon reconsideration of this matter, the committee is willing to take the amendment to conference for further consideration of it there.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is agreeable. I think we may want to get a little further information about the matter.

Mr. STENNIS. The Secretary has written a very strong letter on the subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, earlier, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] asked that I yield to him; and at this time I do so.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi about the item on page 76, in line 19, by which the construction of 1,000 units of family housing at Fort Bliss, Tex., is authorized.

A communication, under date of June 22, has gone from the Department of Defense to Representative JOHN T. RUTHERFORD, of Texas.

In the letter the Department states that the Department of the Army plans to construct the proposed 1,000 units under one general contract, which is considered to be in the best interests of the Government.

My question to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is this: Did the committee, in including the item of 1,000 units at Fort Bliss, Tex., intend to direct the Government to let that contract bid under one bid?

Mr. STENNIS. No; there is certainly no intent on our part to let the contract under one bid.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There is widespread protest over letting the work out under one contract. Contractors tell me they can build the housing cheaper if the contract is broken down to cover units of 100, 200, or 300. Requiring the 1,000 units to be built by one contractor limits the number of contractors who can bid. It is their contention that the Government can get better and cheaper housing if the contract is broken down so more contractors can bid, and thereby make for more competitive bidding. Yet it is stated that it is intended to let the contract out under one general contract, which would thereby limit the number of contractors who could bid.

Mr. STENNIS. We have had reports that there were not many contractors who could build as many as 1,000 units, and that in many of the States no such large projects could be taken care of by one contractor. Really, the only bidders would be large operators from a great distance.

The idea, of course, is to try to get the most for the Government's dollar. If there are cases where local contractors can bid on a smaller number of units and make a better bid, that should certainly have a strong influence with the Department of Defense in issuing the bids in smaller units.

There is another point involved. Refrigerators and other appliances are needed for such houses. A contract for such appliances could be let for 1,000 units, even though the needed housing units were constructed in units of 250 each.

I am glad the Senator from Texas has directed our attention, as well as the attention of the Department of Defense, to this real problem. I hope the Department will take the counsel of the Senator from Texas and others and work out a satisfactory solution.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator from Mississippi for his handling of the bill and for the expression of his sentiments and opinion, because in the area of Fort Bliss, Tex., there is no contractor who can build 1,000 units, but there are a number of contractors who can build several hundred of them. They maintain that, with their local offices and organizations, they can build the houses and give the Government a better bargain than if the contract were to go to one contractor who would have to come from a distance of perhaps a thousand miles and bring to that area its offices and other facilities.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I should like to make a few further remarks with reference to the statement by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Indiana relating to the housing provision. I think each of those Senators made sound, constructive statements relating to Capehart housing for military installations.

Our subcommittee has always favored the idea of appropriated funds for military housing construction. In exercising jurisdiction over the subject, we were not trying to get the subject matter handled altogether by our committee, but were merely exercising surveillance over the program from a military standpoint, and determining the number the committee felt should be built at any installation, and also the total number which should be constructed throughout the Nation in any one particular year.

Those are certainly relevant matters for the committee to pass on and to have the responsibility of passing on.

I again emphasize that, by adoption of the Case amendment, we are not changing the substance of the law or amending it, but are merely extending it.

Mr. President, I assume there are no further amendments to be offered. If that be true, I suggest we have the third reading of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question first comes on the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], which was offered a little while ago.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is absent on official business attending the nuclear test suspension conference in Geneva, Switzerland.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—89

Aiken	Fulbright	Martin
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Green	Morse
Bartlett	Gruening	Morton
Beall	Hart	Moss
Bible	Hartke	Mundt
Bridges	Hayden	Muskie
Bush	Hennings	Neuberger
Butler	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Cannon	Humphrey	Randolph
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Javits	Russell
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Scott
Chavez	Kefauver	Smathers
Church	Kennedy	Smith
Cooper	Kerr	Sparkman
Cotton	Kuchel	Stennis
Curtis	Langer	Talmadge
Dirksen	Lausche	Thurmond
Dodd	Long	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McGee	Yarborough
Engle	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Frear	Mansfield	

NAYS—3

Clark	Douglas	Symington

NOT VOTING—6

Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Gore	Jordan	O'Mahoney

So the bill (H.R. 5674) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am advised that the parliamentary situation is such that Senate bill 2280 should now be indefinitely postponed. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the House bill, as passed by the Senate, be printed so as to show the amendments adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if I may at this time, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 439) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 455) thereon.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, which passed the House this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 439) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution is the usual type, in order to make provision for continuing in operation the functions of the Government, for which annual appropriations for the full fiscal year 1960 have not been perfected. The joint resolution will continue these functions for the month of July, ending July 31, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 439) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 405, Senate bill 1451.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1451) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Mutual Security Act of 1959".

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which is a statement of policy, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.—(a) Through programs of assistance authorized by this Act and its predecessors, the United States has helped thwart Communist intimidation in many countries of the world, helped Europe recover from the wounds of World War II, supported defensive military preparations by nations alerted by Communist aggression, and has soundly begun to help peoples of economically underdeveloped areas to develop their resources and improve their living standards.

"(b) Programs authorized by this Act continue to serve the following principal purposes:

"(1) The Congress of the United States perceives the identity of interest which exists between the people of the United States and the peoples of other lands who are striving to establish and develop politically independent and economically viable units, to produce more goods and services and improve ways of living by methods which reflect popular will, and to establish responsible governments which cooperate with like-minded governments. The Congress declares it to be a primary objective and need of the United States to share these strivings by giving generously of our knowledge and substance to peoples willing to work energetically toward these ends.

"(2) The Congress of the United States recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and nations once free but now subject to such domination. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue as long as such danger to the peace of the world and to the security of the United States persists to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom.

"(c) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

"(1) the United States, through mutual security programs, has made substantial contributions to the economic recovery and rehabilitation of the nations of Western Europe;

"(2) due in part to those programs, it has been possible for such nations to achieve complete economic recovery and to regain their military strength; and

"(3) certain other friendly nations of the world remain in need of assistance in order that they may defend themselves against aggression and contribute to the security of the free world,

those nations that have been assisted in their recovery should, in the future, share with the United States to a greater extent the financial burden of providing aid to those countries which are still in need of assistance of the type provided under this Act.

"(d) It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this Act shall be administered so as to assist other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world and to fulfill their responsibilities for self-government or independence. To this end, assistance shall be rendered where appropriate and feasible in such a way as to promote the emergence of political units which are economically viable, either alone or in cooperation with neighboring units."

CHAPTER I—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Military assistance

SEC. 101. Chapter I of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 103(a), which relates to authorization, to read as follows:

"(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use beginning in the fiscal year 1960 to carry out the purposes of this chapter not to exceed $1,600,000,000, which shall remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the funds made available pursuant to this section, $1,100,000,000 shall be available only for assistance to countries party to the North Atlantic Treaty or for activities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in such countries. Programs of military assistance subsequent to the fiscal year 1960 program shall be budgeted so as to come into direct competition for financial support with other activities and programs of the Department of Defense."

(b) Amend section 105(b), which relates to conditions applicable to military assistance, as follows:

(1) Paragraph (4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Military equipment and materials may be furnished to the other American Republics only in furtherance of missions directly relating to the common defense of the Western Hemisphere which are found by the President to be important to the security of the United States, or for assistance to an international military force under the control of the Organization of American States for the protection of nations against external aggression. The President annually shall review such findings and shall determine whether military assistance is necessary. Internal security requirements shall not be the basis for military assistance programs to American Republics. Of the funds made available pursuant to section 103(a), not more than $65,000,000 shall be available for military assistance in American Republics during the fiscal year 1960. An additional $31,500,000 shall be available during the fiscal year 1960 only for assistance to an international military force under the control of the Organization of American States: *Provided,* That any balance remaining from such $31,500,000 not so used may be transferred from the military assistance account to the special assistance account (sec. 400(a)) and shall be available under the terms of that section only to promote economic development in Latin America."

(2) Add the following new paragraphs:

"(5) To the extent feasible and consistent with the other purposes of this chapter, administrators of the military assistance program shall encourage the use of foreign military forces in underdeveloped countries in the construction of public works and other activities helpful to economic development.

"(6) Military assistance to a country found by the Secretary of State to be underdeveloped shall, unless the Secretary authorizes an exception, be programed, and force goals shall be recommended, according to the principle that economic development needs shall have first call on the internal resources of such country."

CHAPTER II—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Defense support

SEC. 201. Section 131(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to defense support, is amended by striking out "1959" and "$810,000,000" and substituting "1960" and "$835,000,000", respectively.

Development Loan Fund

SEC. 202. Title II of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 203, which relates to capitalization, to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. CAPITALIZATION.—(a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make, during the fiscal years 1960 through 1964, loans to the Fund in amounts needed to cover obligations incurred against the Fund. Except as provided in section 204(b) of this Act, the maximum amount of obligations incurred against the Fund during each of such fiscal years shall be $1,000,000,000; and any unused portion of the maximum applicable to any period shall be added to the maximum applicable to the succeeding period.

"(b) For purposes of the loans provided for in this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use the proceeds of the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act are hereby extended to include this purpose. The President shall determine the terms and conditions of any advances or loans made to the Fund pursuant to this section."

(b) In section 204(b), which relates to fiscal provisions, after the first sentence insert: "The amount of such obligations also may not exceed the limitations specified in section 203(a) of this Act except that, to the extent that assets of the Fund other than capitalization provided pursuant to section 203(a) are available, obligations may be incurred beyond such limitations."

(c) Amend section 205, which relates to management, powers, and authorities, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "three" in the second sentence and substitute "four".

(2) In subsection (c), strike out the last sentence.

Technical cooperation

SEC. 203. Title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 304, which relates to authorization, strike out "$150,000,000" and "1959" and substitute "$179,500,000" and "1960", respectively.

(b) Amend section 306, which relates to multilateral technical cooperation and related programs, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), which relates to contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance and related fund, strike out "$20,000,000" and "1959" and substitute "$30,000,000" and "1960", respectively, and strike out "and for succeeding calendar years not to exceed 40 per centum of the total amount contributed for such purpose for each such year" and insert ", for the calendar year 1959 not to exceed 40 per centum of the total amount contributed for such purpose, and for succeeding calendar years not to exceed 39 per centum of the total amount contributed for such purpose (including assessed and audited local costs) for each such year".

(2) In subsection (b), which relates to contributions to the technical cooperation program of the Organization of American States, strike out "1959" and substitute "1960".

(c) In section 308, which relates to the International Development Advisory Board, insert "or officers" after "officer" in the first sentence and strike out "to administer this title" in that sentence.

Special assistance and other programs

SEC. 204. Title IV of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to special assistance and other programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 400, which relates to special assistance, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), which relates to authorization, strike out "1959" and "$202,500,000" and substitute "1960" and "$244,620,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to assistance to American-sponsored schools and libraries abroad, strike out "$10,000,000" and substitute "$20,000,000".

(b) Insert after section 400 the following new section:

"SEC. 401. UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE.—The Congress of the United States, recognizing the important contribution of the United Nations Emergency Force to international peace and security, declares it to be the policy of the United States and the purpose of this section to support the United Nations Emergency Force. The President is hereby authorized to use during the fiscal year 1960 funds made available pursuant to section 400(a) of this Act for contributions on a voluntary basis to the budget of the United Nations Emergency Force."

(c) In section 402, which relates to earmarking of funds, strike out "1959" in the first sentence and substitute "1960".

(d) In section 403, which relates to responsibilities in Germany, strike out "1959" and "$8,200,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1960" and "$7,500,000", respectively.

(e) Amend section 405, which relates to migrants, refugees, and escapees, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), strike out "1959" and "$1,200,000" and substitute "1960" and "$1,100,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "1959" and "$8,600,000" and substitute "1960" and "$5,200,000", respectively.

(f) In section 406, which relates to children's welfare, strike out "$11,000,000" and "1959" and substitute "$12,000,000" and "1960", respectively.

(g) In section 407, which relates to Palestine refugees in the Near East, strike out "1959" in the first sentence and substitute "1960".

(h) In section 408(c), which relates to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, strike out "four" and substitute "five".

(i) In section 409(c), which relates to ocean freight charges, strike out "1959" and "$2,100,000" and substitute "1960" and "$2,300,000", respectively.

(j) Section 410, which relates to Control Act expenses, is repealed.

(k) Amend section 411, which relates to administrative and other expenses, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "1959" and "$33,000,000" and substitute "1960" and "$39,500,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), strike out ", not to exceed $7,000,000 in any fiscal year,"; and insert before the period ", and for expenses of carrying out the objectives of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (22 U.S.C. 1611): *Provided,* That, in addition, funds made available for carrying out chapter I of this Act shall be available for carrying out the objectives of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 in such amounts as the President may direct".

(l) After section 411, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 412. PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING FUND.—Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 103(a) for use beginning in each of the fiscal years 1960 through 1964, $10,000,000 for each such year shall be available only as follows:

"(a) $5,000,000 shall be available until expended only for financing studies, research, instruction, and other educational activities of citizens of underdeveloped countries in educational institutions in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Such financing may include payment for transportation, tuition, maintenance and other expenses incident to schoiastic activities. The President may employ such funds to augment programs of this character authorized by section 32(b)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, and he may consolidate such portions of such $5,000,000 as he may deem appropriate with

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 2, 1959
For actions of July 1, 1959
86th-1st, No. 110

CONTENTS

Agricultural attaches...41
Appropriations 2,3,15,16,45
Buildings.....6,12
CCC.....30
Contracts.....5
Corn tassel.....28
Credit unions.....27
Economic growth.....24
Electrification.....29
Farm program.....33
Federal-State relations.29
Fisheries.....17,37
Foreign aid.....13,25
Foreign currencies.....4
Forest highways.....2
Forestry.....1,12
Government secrecy.....22
Health.....14
Holidays.....40
Inflation.....9,24
Interest rates.....23
Labor standards.....39
Lands.....1,12
Leave.....36
Legislative program.,12,25
Loans.....13,30,37
Marketing.....19
Monopolies.....12
Mutual security.....13,25
Patents.....8
Personnel.....14,20,21,36
Public debt.....44
Reclamation.....7,32
Reorganization.....1,12
Research.....10,34
Retirement.....20
Security.....21
Soil bank.....18,35
Surplus property.....38
Warehouse receipts.....42
Water conservation.....43
Water resources.....31
Water rights.....11
Wheat.....26

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee voted to report Smith bill to enact Reorganization Plan 1 on forest land authorities. Committee authorized to report bill on Fri., July 3. House to consider resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan 1 on Mon., July 6. Both Houses agreed to conference reports and cleared for President: Commerce appropriation bill. State-Justice appropriation bill. Senate debated mutual security authorization bill. Senate committee voted to report employee health insurance bill.

HOUSE

1. FORESTRY; REORGANIZATION. The Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 7681, to enact the provisions of Reorganization Plan 1 which would transfer from Interior to this Department certain authorities for the exchange or sale of forest land and timber (p. D556). The Committee was granted permission to file a report on the bill by noon, Fri., July 3 (p. 11373).

   Rep. McCormack announced that H. Res. 295, providing for the disapproval of Reorganization Plan 1, will be considered Mon., July 6, but any votes on measures that day will go over to Tues., July 7 (p. 11384). Agreed to a request by Rep. Smith, Iowa, that debate on this measure will be limited to 2 hours (p. 11396).

2. COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7349, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 11304-6,

11372). The House receded and concurred in an amendment of the Senate appropriating $30 million for forest highways, consisting of $26,250,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1959, and $3,750,000, the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1960 (p. 11372). This bill will now be sent to the President.

3. STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7343, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 11301-3, 11371-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.

4. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 5674, to authorize construction at military installations, including the use of foreign currencies under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing construction (p. 11369). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

5. CONTRACTS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7086, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 3 years, until June 30, 1962 (pp. 11310-1, 11369-71). This bill will now be sent to the President.

6. PUBLIC BUILDINGS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 7645, to provide additional authority to GSA for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government. pp. 11395, 11409

7. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 804, to authorize Interior to construct and maintain the Spokane Valley Federal reclamation project, Wash. and Ida. (H. Rept. 622). p. 11409

8. PATENTS. The Judiciary Committee reported H. R. 4059, with amendment, to amend title 28 of the U. S. Code to protect copyrights from Government infringement (H. Rept. 624), and H. R. 2739, without amendment, to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office on patents (H. Rept. 623). p. 11409

9. INFLATION. Rep. Schwengel discussed the danger of inflation, and stated that it "leads in only one direction -- to the destruction of our system of free competition." pp. 11396-9

10. RESEARCH. Received a Nebr. Legislature resolution urging the establishment of a laboratory at the Univ. of Nebraska College of Agriculture "for the purpose of doing both basic and applied research on problems concerned with finding new uses and outlets for agricultural products." p. 11410

11. WATER RIGHTS. Received an Ill. Legislature resolution favoring the preservation of State water rights. pp. 11410

12. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced the following legislative program: Mon., July 6: H. Res. 295, disapproving Reorganization Plan 1 on forestry; Consent Calendar; and S. 726, enforcement of antitrust laws; Tues. and remainder of the week: Private Calendar and H. R. 7645, granting additional authority to GSA over public buildings. p. 11384

SENATE

13. MUTUAL SECURITY. Continued debate on S. 1451, the mutual security authorization bill for 1959 (pp. 11272, 11266-7, 11306, 11309, 11312-48, 11351-62).

Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Johnson which would direct the Secretary of State to submit to Congress by Jan. 3, 1960, a specific plan for the creation of a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between the East and West (pp. 11312-3).

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Genesis 24: 40: *The Lord will send His angel with thee, and prosper thy way.*

Almighty God, apart from whom we have neither wisdom nor understanding, Thou art aware of our many daily needs and acquainted with the things which so frequently cloud our minds and disturb our emotions.

Grant unto us Thy peace to sustain and strengthen us and Thy divine power that will enable us to think clearly and act wisely and live happily.

May the duties and tasks of our high vocation never lose their sanctity and solemnity and, at the beginning of each new day, may we review the vows, which we have taken, and resolve to serve Thee and our generation faithfully.

Inspire us with a greater zeal to seek the welfare and share in the interests of others and may they feel our friendly spirit and sense our good will toward them and find encouragement in our sympathy and kindness.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who went about doing good and whose thoughts concerning us are those of love and peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5674. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM SECRETARY OF THE SENATE DATED JUNE 30, 1959

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House.

The Clerk read the communication, as follows:

JUNE 30, 1959.

The Honorable The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on Tuesday, June 30, 1959, the following messages:

That the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 439 entitled "Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes";

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7175) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes";

That the Senate agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 16, 26, and 30 to said bill; and

That the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 59-13.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had, on June 30, 1959, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 439. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on Tuesday, June 30, 1959, he did on that day sign the following enrolled joint resolution of the House:

H.J. Res. 439. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 5674, an act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, KILDAY, DURHAM, RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, ARENDS, GAVIN, NORBLAD, and OSMERS.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate on the bill S. 1120 this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7086) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 30, 1959.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House met with the conferees on the part of the Senate on yesterday afternoon on the differences between the House and Senate versions of H.R. 7086, a bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951. It was decided that the managers on the part of the House would agree with the Senate's conclusion that this program should be extended for 3 years in lieu of the 4 years proposed in the bill as it passed the House.

The Senate conferees agreed to accept a provision of the House bill extending the present 2-year carry forward of renegotiation losses to 5 years.

It was further agreed that the House conferees would accept an amendment offered by the Senate to increase the

salary of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board to make it on an equal footing with the salary of other general counsels of other agencies.

It was agreed, furthermore, that we would go along with the idea of a study both of procurement and renegotiation policies procedures and practices. That was done after consultation with our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee and after consultation with the distinguished Senator from Georgia who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. Both gentlemen agreed that they would accept this language requiring a study of procurement by their respective committees.

Then we have directed the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make a study with respect to the Renegotiation Act and the procedures under it. We have referred specifically to the Joint Committee for purposes of study all of the various material that was contained in the House bill and the material that was suggested for inclusion by the Senate. These matters, therefore, are not in the conference report but have been referred for this further study and report.

Thus, the conference report does the very simple thing of extending the act for 3 years; it provides for these studies; it upgrades the salary of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board, and changes one provision of existing law with respect to the carrying forward of losses from 2 years under the present law to 5 years as was provided in the House bill.

The conference report was signed by all of the managers both on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate. It is a unanimous report, and I suggest to the House that it is a satisfactory solution to this problem of continuing the Renegotiation Act.

Undoubtedly, as was stated by all of us when we had the matter before the House earlier this year, we cannot afford to permit this program to be terminated at a time when expenditures for defense are running as high as they are. I think all of us will agree that a lot can be accomplished by a very thorough study of procurement practices of the Department and of the policies and practices of the Renegotiation Board, because both of them are intertwined, interrelated; both of them can, in my opinion, be improved; and we hope as a result of this study that we will later be in a position in the Armed Services Committee and the Ways and Means Committee to suggest improvement in both areas.

I feel that the House should accept this conference report because I am sure it will be satisfactory to all Members upon full analysis by the membership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

(Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference agreement to H.R. 7086 and urge my colleagues in the House to vote in favor of its adoption.

In summary terms the conference agreement includes one amendment contained in the House-passed version of the bill and the entire Senate-passed bill except for the deletion of a Senate floor amendment. The House amendment retained in the bill provides for a 5-year carry-forward of renegotiation losses in lieu of the present 2-year carry-forward. This 5-year carry-forward will apply only if the loss occurs in a fiscal year which ended on or after December 31, 1956.

The Renegotiation Act is extended for 3 years with a termination date of June 30, 1962, under the conference agreement. As approved by the conference committee there is a provision relating to the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board. A Senate amendment providing for a study by the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate into procurement policies and practices of the Defense Establishment was approved by the conferees with the studies to be completed and reports made thereon not later than September 30, 1960. Another provision approved by the conferees directs the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make a full and complete study of the Renegotiation Act and the policies and practices of the Renegotiation Board. This study and the report thereon are to be completed by not later than March 31, 1961.

The conference agreement deletes a series of meritorious House amendments and one meritorious Senate amendment as follows: The House bill contained a number of amendments improving procedures, encouraging efficiency incentives, and strengthening the position of small business in contracting and subcontracting practices. The Senate bill contained an amendment providing that no profit limitation could be inserted in any Government contract subject to the Renegotiation Act even though such business would not in fact be subject to the renegotiation process because of the $1 million statutory annual minimum of receipts and accruals that are renegotiable. The conferees in deleting these House amendments and the Senate amendment specifically referred these matters to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to be included within the study of renegotiation to which I have previously referred. It is made clear that subsequent legislative action in these areas would not have to await the completion of the study or the determination of the 3-year extension proposed in the conference agreement. In addition the report on these matters dealt with by the House and Senate amendments are to be completed at the earliest date possible.

The conferees have made it clear that there is no inference to be drawn, insofar as the rights of contractors and subcontractors in pending cases or otherwise are concerned, from the fact that provisions contained in either the House bill or the Senate bill have not been retained in conference.

Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference agreement. While the House conferees endeavored to retain more of the House version of the bill it was not possible to do so under the exigencies of the situation. It will be recalled that the present renegotiation authority terminated on June 30, 1959. In view of the fact that approximately $20 billion of the $40 billion in defense expenditures constitutes renegotiable procurement it is important that the renegotiation authority be continued until we succeed in completing the study provided for under the conference agreement or until we succeed in improving procurement practices.

I regret that we have to use this renegotiation method of recapturing money from the people to whom we have paid it, presumably because they have rendered services. We do have to retain the right to renegotiate contracts, because basically we are not able to make a firm contract in advance of the time the work begins. It seems to me we should not establish as a permanent policy of our Government this unusual method of recovering funds because a corporation or an individual has been overpaid. That is the basis upon which we seek to regain the money which has been paid to the contractor for services rendered. Of course, the right way to do the thing is by competitive bidding. That is the method that has been traditionally followed in this country for generations. It is the time-tested and approved method for doing business; but because in this defense field there are areas wherein we have not seen fit to use the tried and approved method of bidding and to utilize competition, we have had to evolve and work out this method of renegotiation.

The Committee on Ways and Means in its consideration of this legislation decided to adopt certain amendments to the bill. The other body has seen fit to direct a continuing and exhaustive study under the leadership of other committees of the Congress. The conferees have agreed unanimously to go along with those Senate proposals. I was pleased to join in that change in the proposition made on the House side because I believe that while this bill is limited to a 3-year period, if as a result of these investigations inequities and improprieties are discovered, we will then take up the matter for consideration prior to the termination date.

I think, all in all, this is a good bill. I believe it deserves the support of the Members of this body. I ask, along with our distinguished chairman, your support of the conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

national railroad freight car supply; S. 1845, relating to patents; and S. 1855, increase in acreage for mineral leases in Alaska. pp. 13206-7

HOUSE

14. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; COTTON. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7740, to provide for the preservation of acreage history and the reallocation of unused cotton acreage allotments (H. Rept. 728). p. 13282

15. VETERANS' LOANS. The Veterans' Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7903, to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct loan program for two years (H. Rept. 726). p. 13282

16. LANDS; MINERALS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported the following bills: H. R. 6939, with amendment, to amend the act providing for the leasing of coal lands in Alaska in order to increase the acreage limitation in such act (H. Rept. 716); and H. R. 5849, without amendment, to modify conditions under which Alaska may select lands made subject to lease, permit, license, or contract (H. Rept. 725). p. 13282

17. LAMB GRADING. Rep. Roosevelt commended the Secretary "on his recent decision to retain Federal grading of lamb," and stated that he hoped "that in the future grade standards could be revised to the satisfaction of those concerned without proposing anything as drastic as the abolition of a protection as important as the Federal grading on meat." p. 13271

18. INFORMATION; RESEARCH. Rep. Daddario commended the action of the conferees on the Independent Offices appropriation bill in restoring funds for the translation and dissemination of scientific information and for a study for a National Institute for Atmospheric Research. p. 13272

19. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Rep. Wolf inserted a letter by a college professor favoring enactment of S. 1138, to provide veterans' benefits to those who serve in the Armed Forces between Jan. 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963. p. 13279

20. MUTUAL SECURITY. Began and concluded debate on H. R. 8385, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1960. The final vote was delayed until today (July 29). pp. 13210-68

Rejected the following amendments: (1) by Rep. Alexander, to reduce advances to the Development Loan Fund from $550,000,000 to $500,000,000 (pp. 13250-2); and (2) by Rep. Dowdy 53 to 125, to provide that no mutual security appropriations shall be expended if such expenditure will increase the public debt (pp. 13254-5).

A point of order by Rep. Passman on an amendment offered by Rep. Flynt was sustained on the ground that it was legislation on an appropriation bill. This amendment would have provided that no mutual security appropriations could be expended until Congress, by concurrent resolution, found that budget receipts exceeded estimated expenditures, and if not, the appropriations would be reduced accordingly. p. 13254

Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., stated that "another matter requiring long-range planning is that of local currencies. Many of these programs generate local currencies. Public Law 480 generates foreign currencies. It was said in the committee that if this is continued we are going to be 'up to our ears in rupees'" (p. 13235). Reps. Passman and Curtis discussed the large amount of foreign currencies (part of which generated by Public Law 480) on hand (p. 13244).

The bill includes $550,000,000 for advances to the Development Loan Fund. $181,500,000 for technical cooperation programs, and $2,300,000 for the payment of ocean freight charges to move supplies donated to and by American voluntary agencies. Concerning cash grants and loans financed from economic funds, the committee report raises the question as to "whether our foreign policy objectives could not be equally served by the supplying of commodities and services rather than by the use of such cash transactions."

21. WILDLIFE. The Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee voted to report to the full committee two bills: (1) H. R. 2565 (amended); to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations; and (2) H. R. 7045, to authorize the establishment of the Artic Wildlife Range, Alaska. p. D677

22. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 5674, to authorize the construction at military installations, including the use of foreign currencies under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing construction. p. D678

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Sen. Johnson stating that " ... the development of effective and realistic farm programs is important to us in one way -- the preservation of the family-size farm," and inserting an editorial, "Top Future Farmer." p. A6487

Extension of remarks of Sen. Bridges discussing the farm problem, stating that "the situation is apparently going to get worse before it gets better," and inserting an editorial, "Dilemma." p. A6490

Reps. Bentley and Jonas inserted results of opinion polls including issues on the farm program. pp. A6493, A6528-9

Rep. Derounian inserted an article, "The Egg In Politics." p. A6517

Extension of remarks of Rep. Schwengel inserting an Iowa Farm Bureau Federation's letter to this Department and stating that it outlined "some of the misconceptions which are prevalent about the subsidication of agriculture and th benefactors of these subsidies." pp. A6522-3

Rep. Multer commended and inserted an article, "What Makes the Farm Problem?' pp. A6531-3

Extension of remarks of Rep. Levering inserting an article discussing various public issues including the problem of surpluses and farm prices. pp. A6537-8

24. FORESTS; ALASKA. Extension of remarks of Sen. Bartlett inserting an article, "Eighty Percent of Alaska's Forests Burned; Little Protection." p. A6491

25. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Sen. Monroney inserted an address by Sen. Gore favoring the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy. pp. A6499-501

26. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Patman inserted Rep.Roosevelt's speech discussing the problems of small business in the food industry. pp. A6502-3

27. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Westland inserting an article, "Big Changes Coming In Dairying." p. A6506

28. COTTON. Rep. Hemphill inserted an article urging relief for the textile industry. pp. A6508-9

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 30, 1959
For actions of July 29, 1959
86th-1st, No. 128

CONTENTS

Appropriations..2,10,11,25
Area redevelopment.....6
Banking.....18,25
Civil defense.....7,28
Cotton.....5
Credit unions.....19,25,30
Farm loans.....18
Farm program.....3,26
Foreign affairs.....13
Foreign aid.....8,9
Foreign currencies.....14
Forestry.....27,36
Highways.....23
Housing loans.....15
Imports.....5,36
Information.....17
Insecticides.....12
Interest rates.....31
Lands.....20
Legislative program.....25
Life insurance.....34
Military construction...14
Monopolies.....4
Mutual security.....9
Personnel.....1,22,34
Public debt.....37
Public Law 480.....14
Recreation.....33
Retirement.....22
Soil bank.....32
Sugar.....16
Supply management.....24
Tobacco.....16
Transportation.....21,35
Vocational education....11
Wheat.....29

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Dirksen defended Department's record in submitting farm program legislation. House passed mutual security appropriation bill. Both Houses passed appropriation continuation measure. Senate passed bill to increase salaries of Administrative Assistant Secretaries. House received conference report on Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Sen. Symington introduced and discussed bill to compensate producers under soil bank program for actions based on erroneous information.

SENATE

1. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported S. 1845, to increase the salaries of Administrative Assistant Secretaries, including this Department, to $19,000 per annum. The bill also authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to fix the annual rates of basic compensation of examiners-in-chief of patents, subject to approval of the Civil Service Commission. pp. 13337-8

2. TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 475, the continuing resolution making temporary appropriations to departments and agencies for August pending the enactment of the remaining regular appropriation bills. This measure will now be sent to the President. pp. 13334, 13355-6

3. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Dirksen defended the record of this Department against charges that it had not submitted to Congress adequate drafts of farm program

legislation, listed instances in which such legislation has been submitted during this session, inserted testimony by the Secretary before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee on the matter, and stated "There is the chronology, in all its naked boldness; and I know of no way that it can be denied, and I know of no way that it can be denied that the responsibility is not on the Department of Agriculture. The responsibility is on Congress." p. 13305

4. MONOPOLIES. Passed with amendments S. 716, to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. pp. 13323-33

5. COTTON IMPORTS. Sen. Jordan urged that restrictions be placed on the importation of cotton textiles now, stating that "In the years to come, it will be incomparably harder to place restraints on imports." p. 13301

6. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Sen. Randolph urged the enactment of area redevelopment legislation. p. 13304

7. CIVIL DEFENSE. Sens. Javits and Young, O., debated the merits of increasing Federal expenditures for civil defense protection. pp. 13313-5

8. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Keating inserted an article by Under Secretary of State Dillon, "Imperatives of International Economic Growth," discussing the importance of foreign economic aid. pp. 13299-301

HOUSE

9. MUTUAL SECURITY. Passed, 279 to 136, with amendments H. R. 8385, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1960, after rejecting a motion to recommit (see Digest 127 for a summary of the amendments considered and for a listing of the provisions of the bill affecting this Department). pp. 13354-5, 13366-7

10. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. Conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 7509.(p. 13355). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

11. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6769 (H. Rept. 734). pp. 13357-8, 13381

An amendment concerning the promotion and further development of vocational education and one concerning research and training grants for vocational rehabilitation were reported in disagreement (on the latter amendment it was agreed to make a motion providing for $12,700,000). Another amendment provides that the apportionment to the States under certain sections of the bill for vocational rehabilitation will be on the basis of $29,267,081.

12. INSECTICIDES. Concurred in the Senate amendment (a clerical error) to H. R. 6436, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act so as to include nematocides, plant regulators, defoliants, and dessicants (p. 13356). This bill will now be sent to the President.

13. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Agreed to a resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) which corrected a technical error in S. 1928, to provide for U. S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank (p. 13356). This bill (S. 1928) will now be sent to the President.

14. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Received the conference report on H. R. 5674, to authorize construction at military installations including the use of foreign currencies under Public Law 480 for foreign military housing construction (H. Rept. 729). pp. 13342-54, 13380

86TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 729

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR, 1960

JULY 29, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. VINSON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5674]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

34006—59——1

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,292,600.
Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.
Columbus General Depot, Ohio: Utilities, $2,783,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $3,230,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,285,500.
Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina: Family housing, $190,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.
Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,541,000.
Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,228,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, $2,636,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,260,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $553,000.
Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.
Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.
Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $13,194,000.

Outside the United States

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259,000.
Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.
Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.
Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.
Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $81,830,000.

Sec. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the totol amount of $10,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies ac-

quired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.
Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.
Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.
Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.
Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.
Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.
Fort Ord, California, 500 units.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

Outside the United States

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

Sec. 105. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "technical services facilities (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "technical services facilities (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

(3) Under the subheading "technical services facilities (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

(4) Under the subheading "field forces facilities (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively.

TITLE II

Sec. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including

site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,497,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities, $701,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(*Naval Air Training Stations*)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(*Fleet Support Air Stations*)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,584,250.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(*Marine Corps Air Station*)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,851,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,050,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,000,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Cape Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvemements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development and test facilities, $1,591,000.

Outside the United States

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvemements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $5,400,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $350,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $18,495,000.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the

Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.
Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.
Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.
Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.
Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.
Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.
Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.
Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.
Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 450 units.
Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

Sec. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000".

Sec. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "aviation facilities (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000".

(2) Under the subheading "aviation facilities (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000".

Sec. 207. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "aviation facilities (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000".

(2) Under the subheading "marine corps facilities", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside the United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "communication facilities" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000".

(c) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and "$337,941,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs Area, Colorado: Operational facilities, and real estate, $10,000,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,234,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $255,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,180,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,000,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $787,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,952,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,980,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,047,600.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,168,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $20,000,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Supply facilities, and ground improvements, $187,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas. Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,915,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,071,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $1,461,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,661,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $712,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,098,000.

Vandenburg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $1,820,200.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $557,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $2,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $505,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $74,651,000.

Outside the United States

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,199,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $1,299,000.

Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,778,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Utilities, $106,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $15,160,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

Sec. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $417,541,000.

Sec. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military con-

struction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified locations, 1,083 units and community facilities,

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, 100 units.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 400 units.

Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, 160 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 100 units.
Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 350 units.
Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 400 units.
Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.
Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.
Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.
Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.
Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 156 units.
Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 670 units.
Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.
Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 520 units.
K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 470 units.
Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.
Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.
Loring Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 100 units.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.
Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.
Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 530 units.
Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 820 units.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 400 units.
Travis Air Force Base, California, 600 units.
Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 200 units.
Schilling Air Force Base, Kansas, 200 units.
Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.
Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 600 units.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

Sec. 305. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Outside the United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "alaskan air command", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000" and "$607,725,000" respectively.

Sec. 306. (a) Public Law 85–685 is amended, under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "strategic air command"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000".

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively.

SEC. 307. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to make a study of the need for grade separation on "Old Loop No. 13" which traverses a portion of Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. Expenditure of $25,000 out of appropriations available to the Department of the Air Force is authorized for such study.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $72,363,100; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $81,830,000; section 103, $10,000,000; or a total of $188,403,100.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $113,356,250; outside the United States, $35,300,000; section 202, $18,495,000; section 203, $10,000,000; or a total of $177,151,250.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $296,897,800; outside the United States, $73,058,000; section 302, $417,541,000; section 303, $10,000,000; or a total of $797,496,800.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its Territories and possessions,

under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 507 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(c) the United States Army, Europe, in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991,994);

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is

contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson (now Fort Jackson), South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326): Provided, That the unit cost per bed does not exceed $20,000.

(j) medical facilities in the amount of $2,667,000 for Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska, that is contained in title III, section 301, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 344): Provided, That this authorization shall expire on January 1, 1961, if not funded prior to that date.

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622): Provided, That not more than five thousand units shall be contracted for under the authority of

such section prior to June 30, 1964; and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 409. The Secretary of a military department may acquire by lease for indefinite periods of time real property in the Ryukyu Islands needed by the United States Government. Rentals for such leases may be paid in advance from appropriations available for operation and maintenance except advance payments for periods in excess of five years which shall be from appropriations available for military construction.

SEC. 410. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 411. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

SEC. 412. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall, on or before January 31, 1960, submit to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives complete and detailed information with respect to the various types and kinds of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels being procured by the armed forces of the United States, including the number of each type and kind procured and the cost thereof and the number of each type and kind proposed to be procured and the estimated cost thereof.

(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

SEC. 413. Section 109(a) of Public Law 85–685 (72 Stat. 636, 641) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "However, the Secretary of the Army shall not make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, for sale pursuant to this section, such lands, or interests therein, not exceeding one hundred and eighteen acres for channel straightening, and four

hundred acres for a temporary spoil disposal area for a period of ten years, as the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary for the improvement or maintenance of the Houston Ship Channel Project."

SEC. 414. (a) Section 803(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "And provided further, That no more mortgages shall be insured under this title after September 30, 1960, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date, and not more than twenty thousand family housing units shall be contracted for after June 30, 1959, pursuant to any mortgage insured under section 803 of this title after such date."

(b) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104(b), 204(b), and 304(b) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for after June 30, 1959, and before October 1, 1960, pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of twenty thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this section. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department.

SEC. 415. Section 403 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) On request by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General shall furnish to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, an opinion as to the sufficiency of title to any property on which it is proposed to construct housing, or on which housing has been constructed, under this section. If the opinion of the Attorney General is that the title to any such property is good and sufficient, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to guarantee, or enter into a commitment to guarantee, the mortgagee, under a mortgage on such property which is insured under title VIII of the National Housing Act, against any losses that may thereafter arise from adverse claims to title. None of the proceeds of any mortgage loan hereafter insured under such title VIII shall be used for title search and title insurance costs: Provided, That if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines in the case of any housing project, that the financing of the construction of such project is impossible unless title insurance is provided, the Secretary may provide for the payment of the reasonable costs necessary for obtaining title search and title insurance. Any payments by the Secretary hereunder shall be made from the revolving fund established under section 404(g). Any determination by the Secretary under the foregoing proviso shall be set forth in writing, together with the reasons therefor. The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be promptly notified of each such determination, and of the amount of any payment made by the Secretary for title search and title insurance costs."

SEC. 416. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;
(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;
(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;
(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 417. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78), is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000".

SEC. 418. Section 404(c)(2) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking the first two sentences thereof and substituting the following language: "In any condemnation proceedings instituted to acquire any such housing, or interest therein, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421). The amount of such deposit for the purpose of this section shall not in any case be less than an amount equal to the actual cost of the housing (not including the value of any improvements installed or constructed with appropriated funds) as certified by the sponsor or owner of the project to the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to any statute or any regulation issued by the Federal Housing Commissioner, reduced by the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at the time possession is surrendered, but any such deposit shall not include any excess mortgage proceeds or 'windfalls,' kickbacks and rebates received in connection with the construction of said housing as determined by the Department of Defense, or any other Federal agency. The amount of such deposit in any case where the sponsor or owner has not certified the cost of the project to the Federal Housing Commissioner at the time of the enactment of this Act, shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, in accordance with the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421): Provided, That in the event there is withdrawn from the registry of the court by the owner or sponsor a sum of money in excess of the final award of just compensation, this excess shall be repaid to the United States plus a sum equal to 4 per centum per annum on such excess from the time such sum is deposited in the registry of the court: Provided further, That any court in which money is deposited as provided in this section shall require the furnishing of security by the owner to protect the United States from any loss by reason of a final award of just compensation of less than the amount deposited: And provided further, That the deposit required to be made by this section shall be without prejudice to any party in the determination of just compensation. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application and subject to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 per centum of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding."

SEC. 419. The Secretary of Defense shall not later than September 15, 1959, report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives the results of a complete review of all previously authorized surface-to-air missile sites with the assurance (1) that the review reveals the military necessity for the construction of the sites selected, (2) that the performance and capability of the missiles selected for the respective sites are in consonance with military requirements so as to eliminate, insofar as possible, overlapping of missions and duplication of weapons systems, and (3) that particular attention shall be given to the feasibility of modifying or expediting any of the missile programs for either defense or offense.

SEC. 420. In carrying out in a foreign country any project authorized by this Act or any other Military Construction Act heretofore or hereafter

enacted, currencies of such country acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress) shall, to the extent available and feasible, be used in lieu of dollars. The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for any foreign currencies so utilized in carrying out such projects.

SEC. 421. Titles I, II, and III of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959".

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Aberdeen, South Dakota: Training facilities, $168,000.
Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.
Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.
Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.
Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.
Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.
Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.
Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.
Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.
Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.
Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.
Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.
Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.
Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.
Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.
Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.
Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.
Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.
Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.
Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.
Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.
East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.
El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.
Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.
Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.
Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.
Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.
Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.

Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.
Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.
Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.
La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.
Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.
Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.
Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.
Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.
Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.
Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.
Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.
Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.
Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.
New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.
Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.
Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.
Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.
Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.
Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.
Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.
Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.
Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.
Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.
San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.
San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.
San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.
Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.
Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.
Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.
Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.
Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.
Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.
Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.
Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.
Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.
Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.
Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.
San Jose, California: Parking lot and drill grounds, $1.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(ARMORY)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.
Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.
Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.
Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.
Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.
Bound Brook, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.
Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.
Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.
Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.
Colcville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.
De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.
Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
Elyria, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.
Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.
Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.
Flemington, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Freehold, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.
Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.
Hackettstown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.
Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.
Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.
Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.
Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.
Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.
Martindale Army Air Field, Texas: Training facilities, $210,000.
Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.
Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.
Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.
Newton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Norwalk, Ohio: Training facilities, $140,000.
Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.
Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.
Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.
Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.
Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.
Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.
Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.
Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.
Salem, Oregon:Training facilities, $160,000.
San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.
Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.
Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.
Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.
Tuckerton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.
Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.
Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.
Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.
Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.
(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.
Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.
Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.
Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.
Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.
Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.
Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities, and operational facilities, $364,000

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing, and utilities, $92,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,890,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $188,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Bradley Field, Hartford, Connecticut: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $591,000.

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

Gore Field, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, and operational facilities, $665,000.

Gowen Field, Boise, Idaho: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Halcakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $3,222,000.

Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Ontario Municipal Airport, Ontario, California: Training facilities, $233,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $430,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Tucson Municipal Airport, Tucson, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection: Provided, That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause (3) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."
"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."
"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."
"Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, $300,000."
"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."
"Houston (Number 1), Texas: Training facilities, $323,000."
"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."
"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."
"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."
"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000"; and by striking out in clause (2)(b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place therof "$12,446,000"; and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,079,000".

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:
(a) Army Reserve, $20,916,000;
(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,806,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:
(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;
(b) Air National Guard of the United States, $15,580,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps

Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1)(a), (1)(b), (2), (3)(a), and (3)(b) of section 504, respectively.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959".

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site for a United States Army Reserve Center: Provided, That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.

SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts except that any moneys received under section 601 (2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged.

CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
L. C. ARENDS,
L. H. GAVIN,
WALTER NORBLAD,
FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Legislation in Conference

On April 16, 1959, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 5674 which was the fiscal year 1960 military construction authorization for the three military departments and the Reserve components. On June 30, 1959, the Senate considered the legislation and amended it by striking all language after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill.

TITLE I

Army

In the Army title of the bill, the following items were in disagreement:

The deletion by the Senate of the item at *Redstone Arsenal, Ala.*, relating to the conversion of an existing structure for use as a hospital. In this instance, the Senate receded with an amendment which reinserted the item in the bill but at a reduced cost (the subject of hospitals is dealt with separately and in detail subsequently in this statement).

The second item in disagreement related to the restoration to the bill of the House deletion covering the heating plant and heat distribution system at the *Columbus General Depot, Ohio.* The House receded with respect to this item permitting it to remain in the bill.

Fort Belvoir, Va. The item in disagreement at Fort Belvoir covered air conditioning for that portion of the hospital at this installation which is not presently air-conditioned. The conferees agreed that the authority requested for air-conditioning the entire structure should be granted and the Senate recedes.

Fort Eustis, Va. Again, in this instance, the Senate had deleted a hospital. The Senate receded with an amendment which reduced the cost of the hospital.

Charleston Transportation Depot, S.C.: The House had inserted authority for the construction of 12 appropriated fund housing units for personnel permanently stationed at the depot. The Senate deleted the item from the bill. The conferees agreed that 10, rather than 12, houses should be constructed at this facility and that the cost per housing unit should be limited to $19,000. An authorization, therefore, was agreed to in a total amount of $190,000, and the Senate recedes with an amendment.

Fort Knox, Ky.: The Department's program as submitted to the Congress included an armament shop at this installation. The Senate deleted the shop and the House recedes.

Fort Bragg, N.C.: Although not part of the construction program as submitted to the Congress, the House approved the construction of a post office at Fort Bragg to replace the inadequate and substandard facilities now existing there. The Senate after consideration of the condition of the present structures and the amount of business carried on by this post office agreed to grant the authority requested, and the Senate recedes.

Fort Rucker, Ala.: In this instance, there were internal changes within the total for this station. The House approved a figure which was $26,000 larger than that approved by the Senate. The House recedes.

Fort Sam Houston, Tex.: The item in disagreement was an aircraft hangar with a shop. The House authorized this item while the Senate deleted it. Upon restudy of the background material supporting the provision of this hangar, the conferees agreed that the authority requested should be granted, and the Senate recedes.

Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.: Here was an internal change in the figure approved, with the House authorizing $40,000 more than the Senate. The House recedes.

Fort Ord, Calif.: The House authorized a storage building for aircraft parts while the Senate deleted the item. The House recedes.

Various locations: This reduction by the Senate represents the largest individual cut in the Army title of the bill. The reduction resulted from the restudy of our antiaircraft defense and the Senate version represents the agreed position of the Department of Defense as a result of the study. The House recedes.

Section 102: The Senate reduced this item by $1.5 million. Again, this reduction is in accordance with the agreed plan referred to above relating to our antiaircraft defense. The House recedes.

Section 103: This section authorizes the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security. A notification procedure to the Committees on Armed Services is contained in the section. As the bill was presented to the Congress, the authority requested was in the amount of $17,500,000. The House cut this figure to $5,000,000. The Senate raised the House figure to $10,000,000.

The House conferees agreed that in view of the rapid changes in weapons development and the necessarily rapid revisions in research and development, the allowance of $10,000,000 was not unreasonable, and the House recedes. It is pointed out that this authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except with respect to those projects concerning which the committees have been notified prior to that date. The authority, therefore, is neither continuing nor cumulative.

TITLE II

Navy

Only eight items in the Navy portion of the bill were in disagreement. They are as follows:

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.: The House granted authority for the construction of a hospital at this new installation while the Senate deleted it as it did several other hospitals in the program on the basis that hospital costs throughout the program were excessive. The Senate receded with an amendment which reduces the cost of the hospital to an amount which the conferees agreed is adequate (hospitals generally are dealt with later in this report).

Marine Corps AAS, Yuma, Ariz.: The House approved the installation of a navigational aid at this installation. Subsequent to the House action the FAA revealed that it was going to install a similar navigational aid in the same area, and the item therefore became unnecessary. The Senate deleted the item and the House recedes.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River Command: At this installation the House allowed a fueling station for the P6M seaplane. The Senate deleted the item and the conferees agreed that other facilities could be used. The House recedes.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.: Here the Senate cut $50,000 from the $30,050,000 figure. The House recedes.

NAS, Rota, Spain: The program for this installation as submitted to the Congress contemplated the expenditure of $11,934,000. After considerable deliberation the House granted the authorization requested. The Senate deleted the item in its entirety but later, upon submission by the Navy of a revised plan, reinserted the item in the amount of $5,400,000. The House conferees have reviewed the revised plan and agreed that it will serve the purposes of this installation. The House recedes.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Hawaii: The House granted authority for the construction of ground drainage facilities at this installation. The Senate deleted the item. The conferees agreed that while the facilities requested were desirable, the amount planned for expenditure by the Navy was excessive and, therefore, permitted the authority to remain but reduced the cost to $350,000, with the Senate receding with an amendment.

Section 202: In the classified facilities the House granted the total amount requested. Subsequent revisions in the program and the use of prior authority and funds permitted the reduction of this item subsequent to House consideration. The Senate effected the reduction referred to, and the House recedes.

Section 203: This section is identical in its language with section 103 which is described in detail under the Army title (sec. 103). For the reasons cited under the Army title the House conferees agreed to an authority in the amount of $10,000,000, and the House recedes.

TITLE III

Air Force

Most of the variances between the House and Senate versions of the bill in title III related to minor items of construction which the House had deleted during its consideration of the bill. The items involved were for the most part parachute and dinghy shops at various installations, explosive storage, land easements, and repair shops. None of these represented substantial amounts, and with respect to most of them the House recedes.

There are set out below only those major items which were in disagreement.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colo.: This item appeared in the bill as it was submitted to the Congress. The House committee in accordance with its usual policy struck the item from the bill because its location had not been determined and therefore did not appear to be an item of sufficient firmness to warrant approval. Shortly after House action on the bill the Department of Defense established the location of this headquarters and communicated its decision to the House and Senate. The Senate therefore inserted the item in the bill, and since the action of the House was based solely upon the lack of specific location the House recedes.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: The House approved a research and professional library at this installation while the Senate deleted the item. The conferees agreed that a library for the purposes stated should be provided at this important installation but reduced the cost of it from $806,000 to $500,000, with the Senate receding with an amendment. The conferees agreed that it should be clearly understood that this library will be available for use by all interested personnel, that is, those connected with Lincoln Laboratories, Mitre (MIT), and ADSID (Air Defense Systems Integration Division).

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: The House granted authority for the construction of a hospital at this installation while the Senate, as is indicated previously in this report, deleted it together with several other hospitals on the basis that hospital costs throughout the program were excessive. The Senate recedes with an amendment which reduces the cost of the hospital to an amount which the conferees agree is sufficient to construct an adequate facility (hospitals generally are dealt with later in this report).

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio: At this installation, as at the one immediately above, the House authorized the construction of a hospital while the Senate deleted the item. The Senate recedes with an amendment which reduces the cost of the hospital.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: The House authorized the construction of a photographic laboratory at this installation, the facility to be used by MATS in connection with their mapping activities. The Senate deleted the item, and the House recedes.

George Air Force Base, Calif.: As in the other installations previously cited, the House approved but the Senate struck the hospital proposed for this installation. The conferees agreed upon a lower figure for the construction cost of the hospital, and the Senate recedes with an amendment.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, S.C.: Authority for an aircraft inspection and repair shop was granted by the House at this station. The Senate deleted the item. The Senate recedes.

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii: The House deleted the construction proposed for this facility but the requested authority was granted by the Senate. Based on further, more detailed, information supporting the granting of authority for this construction, the House recedes.

Various locations (Europe): The differences between the House and Senate figures in this case resulted from a number of internal changes and the deletion of a classified facility by the House. The conferees upon reexamination of the classified items proposed, agreed that the authority requested should be granted, and the House recedes.

Section 302: This variance between the House and Senate represents the largest difference between the House and Senate versions in title III. The resultant lower figure which was that granted by the Senate is in consonance with the new antiaircraft defense plan submitted by Secretary of Defense McElroy, and the House for this reason recedes.

Section 303: This section is identical in its language with section 103 which is described in detail under the Army title (sec. 103). For the reasons cited under the Army title the conferees agreed to an authority in the amount of $10,000,000, and the Senate recedes with an amendment.

Capehart housing: There were a substantial number of variances between the House and Senate versions of title III with respect to line items for Capehart family housing. Many of them reflected plans of the Air Force which were not complete at the time the House was considering the bill. After review of the housing needs at the various installations involved the House accepted all of the changes, except that relating to Charleston AFB, S.C., made by the Senate, with the conferees also agreeing that the limitation of 20,000 units for the coming 15 months would remain in the bill.

Section 307: No section similar to this appeared in the House version of the bill. The section would require that all contracts for acquisitions of real estate, grading, landscaping, construction, alteration, etc., at the Air Force Academy which provided for an expenditure in excess of $25,000 would require specific legislation to be enacted hereafter. After a review by the conferees of the status of the construction program of the Air Force Academy it was determined that this provision would not serve a useful purpose and it was deleted, with the Senate receding.

A new *Section 307* was inserted by the conferees reading as follows:

SEC. 307. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to make a study of the need for grade separation on "Old Loop No. 13" which traverses a portion of Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. Expenditure of $25,000 out of appropriations available to the Department of the Air Force is authorized for such study.

TITLE IV

General Provisions

Many of the general provisions are identieal to those whieh appeared in previous military eonstruetion laws and with respeet to these there was no disagreement between the Senate and House versions of the bill.

Variations in the general provisions between the two versions of the bill are as follows:

Section 406: This seetion preserves eertain authorities whieh would otherwise expire under the law. Among them is subseetion (i) dealing with authorization for a hospital at Fort Jaekson, S.C. The Senate had agreed to the preservation of this authority but had limited the per-bed cost of the hospital to $16,000. The eonferees agreed that the bed eost at this hospital should be brought into general eonformity with similar costs at other hospitals and ehanged the $16,000 figure to $20,000.

Section 408: This seetion corresponds to seetion 512 of Publie Law 85–685 and would amend seetion 406 of Publie Law 85–241 so as to exempt one additional category of family housing—i.e. rental-guarantee housing, from the present requirement for inclusion in the annual Military Construetion Aet.

The only differenee between the House and Senate versions was the addition by the Senate of a limitation restrieting the number of rental-guarantee units to be eontracted for to not more than 5,000 units prior to June 30, 1964. The House reeedes.

Section 409: This seetion whieh relates to the leasing of property in the Ryukyu Islands (Okinawa) did not appear in the House version of the bill. The plans of the Department of Defense with respeet to the authority requested in this seetion had not matured until after House aetion had been taken on the bill. The House recedes.

Section 412: The House version of the bill eontained no provision similar to this. The Senate inserted a provision whieh would have prevented the appropriation of any funds after Deeember 31, 1959, to or for the use of any armed forees for the design, development, or proeurement of aireraft or missiles unless the appropriation of sueh funds had been speeifieally authorized by legislation enaeted after that date.

The eonferees agreed that the words "design" and "development" should be strieken from the language and that it be directed solely to the procurement of aircraft and missiles. The eonferees also agreed that the date after whieh authorizing legislation would be neeessary should be ehanged from Deeember 31, 1959, to Deeember 31, 1960. Also inserted by the eonferees was a similar requirement with respect to naval vessels.

The conferees are in agreement that proper diseharge of the legislative responsibilities of the Armed Serviees Committes requires an authorization of the aireraft, missile, and naval vessel proeurement programs and that a thorough examination of these areas might serve to reduce the enormous cost of defense and be of assistanee to the Committees on Appropriations in their eonsideration of the Defense budget.

To implement this agreement, the conferees agreed to insert a new section 412 which will require the submission to the two Houses of a detailed statement with respect to those portions of the budget which relate to the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and also with respect to the procurement currently being made in these areas.

The new section, therefore, will give the two committees a year within which to make such internal changes in their committee structure as may be necessary and to study the field of aircraft, missile, and naval vessel procurement. After this year of preparation, the committees will then be ready to function in the legislative area and will be prepared to submit to their respective Houses soundly conceived and clearly presented programs for legislative consideration.

The conferees wish to point out that in referring to "aircraft," "missiles," and "naval vessels" it intends to refer only to operational aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels since it is to procurement in this area that the committees are directing this new requirement for specific legislative authorization.

The conferees cannot overemphasize their concern over the large expenditures entailed in procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels under the existing broad statutory authorization, as well as the associated expenditures generated in other major budget categories. The conferees agreed that an effective method for maintaining proper surveillance over this procurement would be in the manner described above. The Senate recedes with an amendment.

Section 413: This section was added by the Senate committee since attention had recently been drawn to the fact that rectification and deepening of the Houston ship channel will require the use of certain areas which lie within the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot. The ordnance depot is being disposed of by the General Services Administration and this section will exclude from the disposal the areas needed for the deepening and rectification of the channel. Planning with respect to this matter had not matured prior to completion of action on the bill by the House. The House recedes.

Section 414: This section, which extends the Capehart Family Housing Act until September 30, 1960, and limits the number of Capehart housing units to an additional 20,000 units during that period, was inserted by the Senate committee. Since the President vetoed S. 57, the Housing Act of 1960, the inclusion of the extension of the Capehart Act was indeed provident. The House conferees had no objection to this extension nor to the limitation imposed. The House recedes.

Section 415: The Senate committee during its consideration of the bill inserted language which would have substituted the Government in toto for title insurance companies in performing functions relating to real property on which Capehart housing is proposed for construction.

The conferees agreed that the Senate language should remain in the bill but should be modified by a proviso which permits the Secretary of Defense to expend funds for title insurance if it is found impossible to finance the construction of a Capehart project without this action. The proviso also grants authority for the use of the Wherry housing revolving fund to pay the cost involved in obtaining title search and title insurance.

In the utilization of this additional authority, a requirement is imposed that the Committees on Armed Services be promptly notified of each determination by the Secretary of Defense in this area.

Section 418: This section, which was inserted by the Senate, amends section 404(c)(2) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 in such fashion as to require that the deposit made into the Registry of the Court in condemnation proceedings involving Wherry housing shall be an amount truly representative of the Wherry owner's equity in the project. The section details how this end will be achieved. This section would also provide that where the condemnee draws out of the Registry of the Court an amount greater than the value of the property as ultimately determined by the court, he shall pay to the Government 4 percent per annum on such excess from the time such sum was deposited in the Registry of the Court. The House recedes.

Section 419: In the House version of the bill, there was no section corresponding to section 419. The Senate inserted language which would require that the Secretary of Defense report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House with respect to several individual elements relating to air defense.

The conferees agreed that a new section be inserted requiring that the Secretary of Defense report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of a complete review of all previously authorized surface-to-air missile sites. The report on this review is to provide assurance that the review revealed the military necessity for the construction of the sites selected; that the performance and capability of the missiles selected for the respective sites are in consonance with the military requirements, so as to eliminate, so far as is possible, any overlapping of missions or duplication of weapons systems.

The new section will require also that the report devote particular attention to the feasibility or desirability of modifying or expediting any of the missile programs for either defense or offense. The Senate recedes with an amendment.

Section 420: This section, which had no corresponding language in the House version of the bill, would authorize the use of funds generated by surplus commodity disposals to be used for military construction generally rather than for family housing and community facilities alone, which is the case today. As worded in the Senate version of the bill, the authorization would apply only to projects authorized by this act. The conferees agreed to modify this language so as to give it application to "any project authorized."

Hospitals

During the consideration of the construction bill in the Senate, six hospitals which had been approved by the House were stricken from the bill until, as the Senate report stated, "more realistic cost estimates are forthcoming * * *." The Senate committee stated in the report that it did not intend to imply that these hospitals are not needed, but simply that cost estimates appear to be entirely unrealistic. Subsequent to the Senate consideration of the bill, the Department of Defense submitted further cost estimates on the hospitals which were somewhat lower than those set out in the bill. The conferees were of the view that the costs still could be considered to

be too high and they therefore reduced the cost of all of the hospitals by approximately $2½ million.

These projects have been approved; however, it is expected that further investigations by the Department of Defense and the military departments concerned will be made with a view to effecting further savings within the totals whenever practicable. The investigation should include a review of the necessity for the planned mobilization expansion as well as the need for providing additional space for emergency expansion to care for a large input of patients due to unforeseen circumstances such as epidemics and catastrophes.

Revised Plan for Air Continental Defense

The revised plan which is referred to in the Statement in both titles I and III resulted in substantial reductions in these two titles. The plan provides for a reduction and revision in the planned deployment of both BOMARC and NIKE-HERCULES missile sites, and a revision and strengthening of the electronic ground environment so necessary to the control of the weapons and the air battle.

The BOMARC deployment will be on the perimeter of the east and west coasts and the Canadian border. This deployment is in keeping with the Furnas report. The NIKE defenses will continue to provide for the urban areas now protected, and will be extended to certain carefully selected Strategic Air Command sites. Although it does not affect the military construction authorization bill, the plan further provides for putting more funds, some $137 million, into the NIKE-ZEUS antimissile missile program for engineering development type of work.

Use of Prior Authorizations

The conferees wish to point out that among the deletions from the program contained in the bill are certain items for which there is a continuing construction requirement to adequately protect certain Strategic Air Command bases and other existing missile sites. It is proposed that this construction will be performed under authorization granted in the fiscal year 1959 law. It is desired, therefore, to make it a matter of record that authority for construction granted by Public Law 85–685 may be used to construct the items referred to above with the specific understanding that there will be construction for no more than 15 new SAC base defenses.

TITLE V

Reserve Forces Facilities

Under the Senate amendments to the Reserve Forces facilities title of the military construction bill, $57,695,000 was authorized for Reserve facilities projects, whereas the bill as passed by the House provided $57,128,000 for such projects, resulting in a difference of $567,000 in authorization authority.

Although the total dollar authorization contained in the House and Senate version are somewhat different, the Senate version rescinded previous authorizations in the amount of $1,251,000, whereas the House version rescinded only $628,000 of previous authorization.

Thus, the actual net difference in the total new authorization was limited to $56,000 and therefore the House and Senate bills provided an almost identical amount of new dollar authorization for Reserve Forces facilities.

Inasmuch as the changes made in the amounts of new authorization and rescissions of previously granted authorization were almost entirely made at the request of the Department of Defense and the National Guard Bureau, the House recedes from its position and accepts the Senate substitutions.

Differences in Dollar Authorizations

As the bill passed the House, the authorities granted in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Reserve components titles totaled $1,252,608,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version of the bill totaled $1,211,480,000 or $41,128,000 less than the House version. The total agreed to by the conferees for titles I, II, III, and V is $1,225,475,150. This latter sum is $27,132,850 less than the House version and $13,995,150 more than the Senate version.

Carl Vinson,
Paul J. Kilday,
Carl T. Durham,
L. Mendel Rivers,
Philip J. Philbin,
L. C. Arends,
L. H. Gavin,
Walter Norblad,
Frank C. Osmers, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

O

of State pursuant to the act of January 31, 1881."

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESCRIPTION OF CERTAIN SAFETY REGULATIONS ABOARD VESSELS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 578, S. 2118.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. (A bill (S. 2118) to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "operation", to strike out "storage" and insert "stowage", and in line 14, after the word "operation", to strike out "storage" and insert "stowage", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 481), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to provide against hazard to life and property, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary for vessels subject to inspection and certification by the United States Coast Guard with respect to the following matters:

"(1) Lifesaving equipment, including, but not limited to, the number, type, size, capacity, details of construction, methods of operation, stowage, maintenance, manning, use, testing, and inspecting of such equipment, and drills and exercises necessary to assure proper functioning and use of such equipment.

"(2) Firefighting equipment and precautionary measures guarding against fire, including, but not limited to, the number, type, size, capacity, details of construction, methods of operation, stowage, maintenance, manning, use, testing, and inspecting of such equipment, and drills and exercises necessary to assure proper functioning and use of such equipment.

"(3) Muster lists, including, but not limited to, the posting of such lists, and prescribing the special duties to be performed by crew members in the event of emergency.

"(4) Ground tackle and hawsers, including, but not limited to, the number, size, stowage, use, maintenance, manning, testing, and inspection.

"(5) Bilge systems for the removal of liquid from the various parts of the vessel, including, but not limited to, design, installation, capacity, composition, functioning, manning, testing, and inspection.

"(b) In prescribing rules and regulations pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall give consideration to the age, size, service, route, and other factors affecting the operation of the vessels.

"(2) Unless otherwise prescribed by treaty or other international agreement, the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be applicable to all foreign vessels carrying passengers from ports of the United States.

"(3) The Secretary may, upon his own motion, or upon the application of any interested party, determine that the application to any vessel of the rules and regulations prescribed pursuant to this section, or any part thereof, is not necessary in the public interest, and he may order such vessel exempt from their application upon such terms and conditions and for such periods of time as he may specify in the order.

"(c) The owner or operator of any vessel who neglects or refuses to provide and equip his vessel with the lifesaving, firefighting, or other equipment, or take other measures required by the rules or regulations issued pursuant to this section shall be liable to the United States in a penalty of $1,000 for each such neglect or refusal for which sum the vessel shall be liable and may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the violation; and any master or person in charge of such vessel who so defaults shall be liable to a penalty of $500.

"(d) Any person who willfully and knowingly manufactures or sells, or offers for sale, or has in his possession with intent to sell, any lifesaving, firefighting, or other equipment subject to the provisions of title 52 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, which is so defective as to be inefficient to accomplish the purpose for which it is intended, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and may, in addition thereto, in the discretion of the Court, be imprisoned for a term not exceeding five years."

SEC. 2. To the extent that any existing provision of law, or any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant thereto, is in conflict with any provision of section 4488 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 481), such section as amended by this Act, and the rules and regulations hereafter prescribed pursuant thereto, shall prevail.

SEC. 3. (a) The following Acts or parts of Acts and all amendments thereto are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 4470 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 463).

(2) Section 4471 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 464).

(3) Section 4479 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 472).

(4) Section 4481 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 474).

(5) Section 4482 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 475).

(6) Section 4483 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 476).

(7) Section 4492 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 490).

(8) Section 2(a) of the Act of October 9, 1940 (ch. 777, 54 Stat. 1028; 46 U.S.C. 463a).

(9) Section 11 of the Act of May 28, 1908 (ch. 212, 35 Stat. 428; 46 U.S.C. 396).

(b) Any reference in any other law to any Act, or any part thereof, repealed by this Act shall be deemed as a reference to section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 481).

SEC. 4. Any rights or liabilities existing on the effective date of this Act shall not be affected by the enactment of this Act. Any procedures or rules or regulations in effect on the effective date of this Act shall remain in effect until modified or superseded under the authority of this Act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill is recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Coast Guard. It was reported unanimously by the committee.

The purpose of the bill is to revise the archaic and preclusive regulations relating to lifesaving appliances on ocean, lake, and sound steamers and foreign vessels. It would repeal certain inadequate and obsolete statutory provisions relating to safety equipment and systems aboard vessels. Some of these statutes were enacted more than a half century ago, are now obsolete, or of limited applicability because of advances in science, and should be repealed, as they no longer serve a useful purpose. The bill gives the Coast Guard the authority to make regulations according to modern conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF PHILADELPHIA ARMY BASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 568, S. 2210.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2210) to provide for the disposition of the Philadelphia Army Base, Philadelphia, Pa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this bill will be the unfinished business of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 30, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Thessalonians 5: 15: *Ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all men.*

Almighty God, as we again draw nigh unto Thee in prayer, may we surrender our wills to Thine and yield our spirits to Thy spirit to be led in the ways of purity and peace.

We pray that Thou wilt strengthen and sustain us in the fulfillment of our daily duties and so rule us by Thy wisdom and power that we shall always desire and do that which is right and well pleasing unto Thee.

Help us to find in the common experiences and routine tasks of life, opportunities and occasions to serve Thee and achieve blessedness for all mankind.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 107. An act to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to Federal ship mortgage insurance, in order to include floating drydocks under the definition of the term "vessel" in such title;

S. 2424. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that the equal-time provisions with respect to candidates for public office shall not apply to news and other similar programs; and

S.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to extend the voluntary home mortgage credit program.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 729)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Technical Services Facilities

"(Ordnance Corps)

"Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

"Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

"Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,292,600.

"Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

"(Quartermaster Corps)

"Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

"Columbus General Depot, Ohio: Utilities, $2,783,000.

"(Chemical Corps)

"Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

"Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Reserach development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

"(Signal Corps)

"Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $3,230,000.

"(Corps of Engineers)

"Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.

"(Transportation Corps)

"Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,285,500.

"Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina: Family housing, $190,000.

"(Medical Corps)

"Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.

"Field Forces Facilities

"(First Army Area)

"Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.

"Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

"(Second Army Area)

"A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.

"Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,541,000.

"Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

"(Third Army Area)

"Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.

"Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,228,000.

"Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.

"Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $2,636,000.

"Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

"(Fourth Army Area)

"Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,260,000.

"Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.

"Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

"(Fifth Army area)

"Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.

"Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical facilities and utilities, $553,000.

"Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

"(Sixth Army area)

"Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, $218,000.

"(United States Military Academy)

"United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000.

("Alaska Command area)

"Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.

"Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

"(Tactical installations and support facilities)

"Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $13,194,000.

"Outside the United States

"(Pacific Command area)

"Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.

"Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259,000.

"Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.

"Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

"(Caribbean Command area)

"Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

"(European Command area)

"France: Training facilities, $140,000.

"Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

"Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

"(Army Security Agency)

"Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

"(Strategic Army Communications)

"Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities $1,288,000.

"SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $81,830,000.

"SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

"(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

"Various locations, France, 400 units.

"Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

"(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Inside the United States

"ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.
"Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.
"Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.
"Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.
"Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.
"Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.
"Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.
"Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.
"Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.
"Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.
"Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.
"Fort Ord, California, 500 units.
"Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.
"Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

"Outside the United States

"Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

"SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States', in section 101, as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)', with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out '$2,288,000' and insert in place thereof '$2,613,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Quartermaster Corps)', with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out '$464,000' and insert in place thereof '$597,000'.

"(3) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)', with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out '$1,936,000' and insert in place thereof '$2,276,000'.

"(4) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Fifth Army Area)', with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out '$4,663,000' and insert in place thereof '$5,051,000'.

"(b) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts '$116,915,000' and '$294,394,000' and inserting in place thereof '$118,101,000' and '$295,580,000', respectively.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Shipyard Facilities

"Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

"David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

"Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,497,000.

"Fleet Base Facilities

"Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

"Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities, $701,000.

"Aviation Facilities

"(Naval air training stations)

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000.

"Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

"(Fleet Support Air Stations)

"Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,584,250.

"Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities $305,000.

"Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

"(Marine Corps Air Station)

"Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

"Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $48,000.

"Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

"Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,851,000.

"(Special Purpose Air Stations)

"Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Spring, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

"Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

"Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,050,000.

"Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

"Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,000,000.

"Supply Facilities

"Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

"Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

"Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

"Marine Corps Facilities

"Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

"Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

"Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, Califorina: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

"Ordnance Facilities

"Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

"Service School Facilities

"Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

"Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

"Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing and utilities, $4,712,000.

"Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real estate, $81,000.

"Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

"Medical Facilities

"Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

"Communication Facilities

"Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

"Naval Security Group Activity, Cape Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

"Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

"Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

"Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

"Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

"Office of Naval Research Facilities

"Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development and test facilities, $1,591,000.

"Outside the United States

"Shipyard Facilities

"Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

"Aviation Facilities

"Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000.

"Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000.

"Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

"Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

"Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

"Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

"Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $5,400,000.

"Supply facilities

"Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

"Communication facilities

"Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

"Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

"Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $350,000.

"Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

"Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

"Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

"Yards and docks facilities

"Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

"Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

"SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $18,495,000.

"SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installation and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

"(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

"Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

"(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

"Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

"Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

"Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

"Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.

"Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

"Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.

"Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.

"Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 450 units.

"Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.

"Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.

"Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

"SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, '$72,785,000', and inserting in place thereof '$72,935,000'.

"(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts '$72,785,000', and '$212,833,000', and inserting respectively in place thereof '$72,935,000' and '$212,983,000'.

"SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' in section 201, as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)', with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out '$511,000' and inserting in place thereof '$664,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)' with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out '$273,000' and inserting in place thereof '$330,000'.

"(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts '$312,004,000', and '$460,716,000' and inserting respectively in place thereof '$312,214,000', and '$460,926,000'.

"SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' in section 201, as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)', with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out '$39,000' and inserting in place thereof '$52,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'MARINE CORPS FACILITIES', with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out '$1,469,000' and inserting in place thereof '$1,596,000'.

"(b) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended under the heading 'OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES' in section 201 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'COMMUNICATION FACILITIES' with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out '$130,000' and inserting in place thereof '$320,000'.

"(c) Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts '$230,356,000', '$48,199,000', and '$337,611,000', and inserting respectively in place thereof '$230,496,000', '$48,389,000', and '$337,941,000'.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Air Defense Command

"Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

"Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

"Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

"Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

"K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.

"Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.

"Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

"McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.

"Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.

"NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs Area, Colorado: Operational facilities, and real estate, $10,000,000.

"Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,234,000.

"Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarilio, California: Operational facilities and real estate, $255,000.

"Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

"Seifridge Air Force Base, Mount Ciemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.

"Suffoik County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

"Tyndail Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

"Alaskan Air Command

"Eielson Air Force Base, Aiaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

"Elmendorf Air Force Base, Aiaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

"Gaiena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

"King Saimon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

"Ladd Air Force Base, Aiaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

"Various locations, Aiaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

"Air Materiel Command

"Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

"Hiil Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

"Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,180,000.

"McClelian Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

"Oimsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $2,676,000.

"Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.

"Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okiahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

"Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,000,000.

"Air Research and Development Command

"Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tuliahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

"Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $787,000.

"Eglin Air Force Base, Vaiparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

"Holioman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

"Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,952,000.

"Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

"Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

"Air Training Command

"Amariiio Air Force Base, Amarilio, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

"James Connaliy Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

"Lackiand Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

"Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

"Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,980,000.

"Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

"Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,047,600.

"Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

"Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,168,000.

"Air University

"Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

"Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

"Headquarters Command

"Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $20,000,000.

"Military Air Transport Service

"Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

"Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.

"McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

"Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Barksdaie Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

"Beaie Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Supply facilities, and ground improvements, $187,000.

"Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

"Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

"Blythevile Air Force Base, Blythevile, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

"Bunker Hiii Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

"Carsweil Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

"Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

"Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

"Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,915,000.

"Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

"Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

"Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

"Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,071,000.

"Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

"Eilsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

"Fairchiid Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

"Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.

"Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $1,461,000.

"Giasgow Air Force Base, Giasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,661,000.

"Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

"Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

"Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

"Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

"Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

"Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

"MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

"Maimstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $712,000.

"March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.

"McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

"McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

"Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

"Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000.

"Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000.

"Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

"Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

"Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

"Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,098,000.

"Vandenburg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

"Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

"Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

"Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.

"Tactical Air Command

"Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

"England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

"George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $1,820,200.

"Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.

"Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $557,000.

"Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $2,249,000.

"Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

"Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $505,000.

"Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

"Aircraft Control and Warning System

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $74,651,000.

"Outside the United States

"Military Air Transport Service

"Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,199,000.

"Pacific Air Forces

"Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $1,299,000.

"Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,778,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Utilities, $106,000.

"Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

"United States Air Forces in Europe

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $15,160,000.

"United States Air Force Security Service

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

"Special facilities

"Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

"Aircraft control and warning system

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

"SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $417,541,000.

"SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

"(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

"Various locations, France, 300 units.

"Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

"Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

"Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

"Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

"Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

"High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

"Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

"Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

"Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

"Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

"Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

"Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

"Classified locations, 1,083 units and community facilities.

"(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, 100 units.

"Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

"Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 400 units.

"Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, 160 units.

"Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 100 units.

"Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 350 units.

"Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

"Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 400 units.

"Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

"Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

"Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

"Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

"Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

"Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 156 units.

"Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.

"Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 670 units.

"Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

"Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 520 units.

"K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 470 units.

"Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

"Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

"Loring Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

"Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 100 units.

"Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.

"Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

"Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 530 units.

"Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.

"Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 820 units.

"Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 400 units.

"Travis Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

"Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 200 units.

"Schilling Air Force Base, Kansas, 200 units.

"Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

"Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

"Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

"Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

"SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended, under the heading 'OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES' in section 301, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'ALASKAN AIR COMMAND', with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out '$1,630,000' and insert in place thereof '$1,895,000'.

"(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts '$160,705,000', and '$607,460,000' and inserting in place thereof '$160,970,000' and '$607,725,000', respectively.

"SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85–685 is amended, under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' in section 301 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND'—

"(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out '$1,832,000' and insert in place thereof '$2,182,000'.

"(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out '$3,265,000' and insert in place thereof '$3,890,000'.

"(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out '$15,552,000' and insert in place thereof '$16,655,000'.

"(b) Public Law 85-685 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts '$542,161,000' and '$952,415,000' and inserting in place thereof '$544,239,000' and '$954,493,000', respectively.

"SEC. 307. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to make a study of the need for grade separation on 'Old Loop No. 13' which traverses a portion of Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. Expenditure of $25,000 out of appropriations available to the Department of the Air Force is authorized for such study.

"TITLE IV

"General Provisions

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

"SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

"(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $72,363,100; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $81,830,000; section 103, $10,000,000; or a total of $188,403,100.

"(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $113,356,250; outside the United States, $35,300,000; section 202, $18,495,000; section 203, $10,000,000; or a total of $177,151,250.

"(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $296,897,800; outside the United States, $73,058,000; section 302, $417,541,000; section 303, $10,000,000; or a total of $797,496,800.

"SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

"SEC. 404. Whenever—

"(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

"(2) The Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

"SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

"SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

"(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

"(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

"(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

"(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

"(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

"(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 507 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

"(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

"(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

"(c) the United States Army, Europe, in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

"(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

"(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

"(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading 'CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES' and subheading 'AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)' of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

"(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)' in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

"(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States.

"(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson (now Fort Jackson), South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326): *Provided*, That the unit cost per bed does not exceed $20,000.

"(j) medical facilities in the amount of $2,667,000 for Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska, that is contained in title III, section 301, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 344): *Provided*, That this authorization shall expire on January 1, 1961, if not funded prior to that date.

"SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit.'

"SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622): *Provided*, That not more than five thousand units shall be contracted for under the authority of such section prior to June 30, 1964; and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code.'

"SEC. 409. The Secretary of a military department may acquire by lease for indefinite periods of time real property in the Ryukyu Islands needed by the United States Government. Rentals for such leases may be paid in advance from appropriations available for operation and maintenance except advance payments for periods in excess of five years which shall be from appropriations available for military construction.

"SEC. 410. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"'(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be

four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major.'

"(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"'(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander.'

"(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"'(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major.'

"SEC. 411. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

"SEC. 412. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall, on or before January 31, 1960, submit to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives complete and detailed information with respect to the various types and kinds of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels being procured by the armed forces of the United States, including the number of each type and kind procured and the cost thereof and the number of each type and kind proposed to be procured and the estimated cost thereof.

"(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

"SEC. 413. Section 109(a) of Public Law 85-685 (72 Stat. 636, 641) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: 'However, the Secretary of the Army shall not make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, for sale pursuant to this section, such lands, or interests therein, not exceeding one hundred and eighteen acres for channel straightening, and four hundred acres for a temporary spoil disposal area for a period of ten years, as the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary for the improvement or maintenance of the Houston Ship Channel Project.'

"SEC. 414. (a) Section 803(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *'And provided further,* That no more mortgages shall be insured under this title after September 30, 1960, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date, and not more than twenty thousand family housing units shall be contracted for after June 30, 1959, pursuant to any mortgage insured under section 803 of this title after such date.'

"(b) Nothwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104(b), 204(b), and 304(b) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for after June 30, 1959, and before October 1, 1960, pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of twenty thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this section. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department.

"SEC. 415. Section 403 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(d) On request by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General shall furnish to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, an opinion as to the sufficiency of title to any property on which it is proposed to construct housing, or on which housing has been constructed, under this section. If the opinion of the Attorney General is that the title to any such property is good and sufficient, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to guarantee, or enter into a commitment to guarantee, the mortgagee, under a mortgage on such property which is insured under title VIII of the National Housing Act, against any losses that may thereafter arise from adverse claims to title. None of the proceeds of any mortgage loan hereafter insured under such title VIII shall be used for title search and title insurance costs: *Provided,* That if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines in the case of any housing project, that the financing of the construction of such project is impossible unless title insurance is provided, the Secretary may provide for the payment of the reasonable costs necessary for obtaining title search and title insurance. Any payments by the Secretary hereunder shall be made from the revolving fund established under section 404(g). Any determination by the Secretary under the foregoing proviso shall be set forth in writing, together with the reasons therefor. The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be promptly notified of each such determination, and of the amount of any payment made by the Secretary for title search and title insurance costs.'

"SEC. 416. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

"(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

"(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

"(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

"(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

"SEC. 417. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78), is amended by striking out '$500,000' and inserting in place thereof '$900,000.'

"SEC. 418. Section 404(c)(2) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking the first two sentences thereof and substituting the following language: 'In any condemnation proceedings instituted to acquire any such housing, or interest therein, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421). The amount of such deposit for the purpose of this section shall not in any case be less than an amount equal to the actual cost of the housing (not including the value of any improvements installed or constructed with appropriated funds) as certified by the sponsor or owner of the project to the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to any statute or any regulation issued by the Federal Housing Commissioner, reduced by the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at the time possession is surrendered, but any such deposit shall not include any excess mortgage proceeds or "windfalls," kickbacks and rebates received in connection with the construction of said housing as determined by the Department of Defense, or any other Federal agency. The amount of such deposit in any case where the sponsor or owner has not certified the cost of the project to the Federal Housing Commissioner at the time of the enactment of this Act, shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, in accordance with the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421): *Provided,* That in the event there is withdrawn from the registry of the court by the owner or sponsor a sum of money in excess of the final award of just compensation, this excess shall be repaid to the United States plus a sum equal to 4 per centum per annum on such excess from the time such sum is deposited in the registry of the court: *Provided further,* That any court in which money is deposited as provided in this section shall require the furnishing of security by the owner to protect the United States from any loss by reason of a final award of just compensation of less than the amount deposited: *And provided further,* That the deposit required to be made by this section shall be without prejudice to any party in the determination of just compensation. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application and subject to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 per centum of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding.'

"SEC. 419. The Secretary of Defense shall not later than September 15, 1959, report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives the results of a complete review of all previously authorized surface-to-air missile sites with the assurance (1) that the review reveals the military necessity for the construction of the sites selected, (2) that the performance and capability of the missiles selected for the respective sites are in consonance with military requirements so as to eliminate, insofar as possible, overlapping of missions and duplication of weapons systems, and (3) that particular attention shall be given to the feasibility of modifying or expediting any of the missile programs for either defense or offense.

"SEC. 420. In carrying out in a foreign country any project authorized by this Act or any other Military Construction Act heretofore or hereafter enacted, currencies of such country acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress) shall, to the extent available and feasible, be used in lieu of dollars. The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for any foreign currencies so utilized in carrying out such projects.

"SEC. 421. Titles I, II, and III of this Act may be cited as the 'Military Construction Act of 1959'.

"TITLE V

"Reserve forces facilities

"SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

"(1) For Department of the Army:

"Army Reserve

"Aberdeen, South Dakota: Training facilities, $168,000.

"Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.
"Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.
"Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000.
"Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000.
"Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
"Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.
"Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.
"Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.
"Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.
"Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.
"Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
"Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.
"Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
"Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
"Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $238,000.
"Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.
"Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.
"Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.
"Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.
"Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.
"Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.
"East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.
"El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.
"Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.
"Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.
"Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.
"Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.
"Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
"Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
"Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.
"Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $238,000.
"Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
"Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.
"La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.
"Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.
"Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
"Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.
"Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.
"Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.
"Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $238,000.
"New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.
"Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
"Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
"Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
"Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.
"Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.
"Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.
"Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.
"Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.
"San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.
"San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.
"San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
"Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.
"Savanah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.
"Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.
"Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.
"Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.
"Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.
"Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.
"Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.
"Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.
"San Jose, California: Parking lot and drill grounds, $1.

"Army National Guard of the United States (Armory)

"Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.
"Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.
"Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.
"Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
"Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
"Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.
"Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
"Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Bound Brook, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
"Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.
"Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.
"Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.
"Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.
"Coleville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.
"De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
"Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.
"Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
"Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
"Elyria, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.
"Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.
"Flemington, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
"Freehold, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
"Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.
"Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.
"Hackettstown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
"Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
"Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.
"Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.
"Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
"Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.
"Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.
"Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.
"Martindale Army Air Field, Texas: Training facilities, $210,000.
"Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000.
"Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.
"Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
"New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.
"Newton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $30,000.
"Norwalk, Ohio: Training facilities, $140,000.
"Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.
"Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.
"Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.
"Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.
"Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
"Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.
"Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
"Ronceverte, West Virginia: Training facilities, $54,000.
"Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.
"Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.
"Salem, Oregon: Training facilitics, $160,000.
"San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
"Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.
"Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.
"Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.
"Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.
"Tuckerton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.

"Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.

"Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

"Army National Guard of the United States
(Nonarmory)

"Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

"Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.

"Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.

"Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

"Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

"(2) For Department of the Navy:

"Naval Reserve (Aviation)

"Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.

"Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.

"Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.

"Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.

"Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.

"Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.

"Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.

"Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.

"Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

"Naval Reserve (Surface)

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve (Ground)

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

"(3) For Department of the Air Force:

"Air Force Reserve

"Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities, and operational facilities, $364,000.

"Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing, and utilities, $92,000.

"Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

"General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

"O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,890,000.

"Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

"Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

"Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $188,000.

"Air National Guard of the United States

"Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

"New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

"Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

"Bradley Field, Hartford, Connecticut: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

"Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $591,000.

"Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

"Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

"Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

"Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

"Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

"Gore Field, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities and operational facilities, $665,000.

"Gowen Field, Boise, Idaho: Operational facilities, $238,000.

"Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

"Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $3,222,000.

"Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

"Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

"Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

"Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

"Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

"Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

"Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

"Ontario Municipal Airport, Ontario, California: Training facilities, $233,000.

"Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $430,000.

"San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $943,000.

"Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

"Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

"Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

"Tucson Municipal Airport, Tucson, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

"Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

"(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided*, That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

"SEC. 502. (a) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading 'NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)' in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"'Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000.'

"'Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000.'

"(b) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading 'AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES' in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

"(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out '$740,000' and insert in place thereof '$1,030,000'.

"(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out '$300,000' and insert in place thereof '$480,000'.

"(c) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading 'ARMY RESERVE' in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

"(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out '$40,000' and insert in place thereof '$61,000'.

"(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out '$85,000' and insert in place thereof '$117,000'.

"(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out '$99,000' and insert in place thereof '$136,000'.

"(d) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading 'ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)' in clause (3) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"'Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000.'

"'Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000.'

"'Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000.'

"'Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, $300,000.'

"'Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.'

"'Houston (Number 1), Texas: Training facilities, $323,000.'

"'Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000.'

"'Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000.'

"'Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000.'

"'Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000.'

"(e) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 '$11,886,000' and inserting in place thereof '$10,582,000'; and by striking out in clause (2)(b) of section 606 '$11,976,000' and inserting in place thereof '$12,446,000'; and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 '$28,330,000' and inserting in place thereof '$27,079,000'.

"SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended,

and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

"SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

"(1) for Department of the Army:

"(a) Army Reserve, $20,916,000;

"(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,806,000.

"(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;

"(3) for Department of the Air Force:

"(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;

"(b) Air National Guard of the United States, $15,580,000.

"SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1)(a), (1)(b), (2), (3)(a), and (3)(b) of section 504, respectively.

"SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the 'Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959'.

"TITLE VI

"SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site for a United States Army Reserve Center: *Provided,* That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.

"SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts except that any moneys received under section 601 (2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged."

CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
L. C. ARENDS,
L. H. GAVIN,
WALTER NORBLAD,
FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On April 16, 1959, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 5674 which was the fiscal year 1960 military construction authorization for the three military departments and the Reserve components. On June 30, 1959, the Senate considered the legislation and amended it by striking all language after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill.

Title I

Army

In the Army title of the bill, the following items were in disagreement:

The deletion by the Senate of the item at Redstone Arsenal, Ala., relating to the conversion of an existing structure for use as a hospital. In this instance, the Senate receded with an amendment which reinserted the item in the bill but at a reduced cost (the subject of hospitals is dealt with separately and in detail subsequently in this statement).

The second item in disagreement related to the restoration to the bill of the House deletion covering the heating plant and heat distribution system at the Columbus General Depot, Ohio. The House receded with respect to this item permitting it to remain in the bill.

Fort Belvoir, Va.: The item in disagreement at Fort Belvoir covered air conditioning for that portion of the hospital at this installation which is not presently air conditioned. The conferees agreed that the authority requested for air conditioning the entire structure should be granted and the Senate recedes.

Fort Eustis, Va.: Again, in this instance, the Senate had deleted a hospital. The Senate receded with an amendment which reduced the cost of the hospital.

Charleston Transportation Depot, S.C.: The House had inserted authority for the construction of 12 appropriated fund housing units for personnel permanently stationed at the depot. The Senate deleted the item from the bill. The conferees agreed that 10, rather than 12, houses should be constructed at this facility and that the cost per housing unit should be limited to $19,000. An authorization, therefore, was agreed to in a total amount of $190,000, and the Senate recedes with an amendment.

Fort Knox, Ky.: The Department's program as submitted to the Congress included an armament shop at this installation. The Senate deleted the shop and the House recedes.

Fort Bragg, N.C.: Although not part of the construction program as submitted to the Congress, the House approved the construction of a post office at Fort Bragg to replace the inadequate and substandard facilities now existing there. The Senate after consideration of the condition of the present structures and the amount of business carried on by this post office agreed to grant the authority requested, and the Senate recedes.

Fort Rucker, Ala.: In this instance, there were internal changes within the total for this station. The House approved a figure which was $26,000 larger than that approved by the Senate. The House recedes.

Fort Sam Houston, Tex.: The item in disagreement was an aircraft hangar with a shop. The House authorized this item while the Senate deleted it. Upon restudy of the background material supporting the provision of this hangar, the conferees agreed that the authority requested should be granted, and the Senate recedes.

Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.: Here was an internal change in the figure approved, with the House authorizing $40,000 more than the Senate. The House recedes.

Fort Ord, Calif.: The House authorized a storage building for aircraft parts while the Senate deleted the item. The House recedes.

Various locations: This reduction by the Senate represents the largest individual cut in the Army title of the bill. The reduction resulted from the restudy of our antiaircraft defense and the Senate version represents the agreed position of the Department of Defense as a result of the study. The House recedes.

Section 102: The Senate reduced this item by $1.5 million. Again, this reduction is in accordance with the agreed plan referred to above relating to our antiaircraft defense. The House recedes.

Section 103: This section authorizes the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforescen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security. A notification procedure to the Committees on Armed Services is contained in the section. As the bill was presented to the Congress, the authority requested was in the amount of $17,500,000. The House cut this figure to $5,000,000. The Senate raised the House figure to $10,000,000.

The House conferes agreed that in view of the rapid changes in weapons development and the necessarily rapid revisions in research and development, the allowance of $10,000,000 was not unreasonable, and the House recedes. It is pointed out that this authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except with respect to those projects concerning which the committees have been notified prior to that date. The authority, therefore, is neither continuing nor cumulative.

Title II

Navy

Only eight items in the Navy portion of the bill were in disagreement. They are as follows:

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.: The House granted authority for the construc-

tion of a hospital at this new installation while the Senate deleted it as did several other hospitals in the program on the basis that hospital costs throughout the program were excessive. The Senate receded with an amendment which reduces the cost of the hospital to an amount which the conferees agreed is adequate (hospitals generally are dealt with later in this report).

Marine Corps AAS, Yuma, Ariz.: The House approved the installation of a navigational aid at this installation. Subsequent to the House action the FAA revealed that it was going to install a similar navigational aid in the same area, and the item therefore became unnecessary. The Senate deleted the item and the House recedes.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River Command: At this installation the House allowed a fueling station for the P6M seaplane. The Senate deleted the item and the conferees agreed that other facilities could be used. The House recedes.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.: Here the Senate cut $50,000 from the $30,050,000 figure. The House recedes.

NAS, Rota, Spain: The program for this installation as submitted to the Congress contemplated the expenditure of $11,934,000. After considerable deliberation the House granted the authorization requested. The Senate deleted the item in its entirety but later, upon submission by the Navy of a revised plan, reinserted the item in the amount of $5,400,000. The House conferees have reviewed the revised plan and agreed that it will serve the purposes of this installation. The House recedes.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Hawaii: The House granted authority for the construction of ground drainage facilities at this installation. The Senate deleted the item. The conferees agreed that while the facilities requested were desirable, the amount planned for expenditure by the Navy was excessive and, therefore, permitted the authority to remain but reduced the cost to $350,000, with the Senate receding with an amendment.

Section 202: In the classified facilities the House granted the total amount requested. Subsequent revisions in the program and the use of prior authority and funds permitted the reduction of this item subsequent to House consideration. The Senate effected the reduction referred to, and the House recedes.

Section 203: This section is identical in its language with section 103 which is described in detail under the Army title (sec. 103). For the reasons cited under the Army title the House conferees agreed to an authority in the amount of $10,000,000, and the House recedes.

Title III

Air Force

Most of the variances between the House and Senate versions of the bill in title III related to minor items of construction which the House had deleted during its consideration of the bill. The items involved were for the most part parachute and dinghy shops at various installations, explosive storage, land easements, and repair shops. None of these represented substantial amounts, and with respect to most of them the House recedes.

There are set out below only those major items which were in disagreement.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colo.: This item appeared in the bill as it was submitted to the Congress. The House committee in accordance with its usual policy struck the item from the bill because its location had not been determined and therefore did not appear to be an item of sufficient firmness to warrant approval. Shortly after House action on the bill the Department of Defense established the location of this headquarters and communicated its decision to the House and Senate. The Senate therefore inserted the item in the bill, and since the action of the House was based solely upon the lack of specific location the House recedes.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: The House approved a research and professional library at this installation while the Senate deleted the item. The conferees agreed that a library for the purposes stated should be provided at this important installation but reduced the cost of it from $806,000 to $500,000, with the Senate receding with an amendment. The conferees agreed that it should be clearly understood that this library will be available for use by all interested personnel, that is, those connected with Lincoln Laboratories, Mitre (MIT), and ADSID (Air Defense Systems Integration Division).

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: The House granted authority for the construction of a hospital at this installation while the Senate, as is indicated previously in this report, deleted it together with several other hospitals on the basis that hospital costs throughout the program were excessive. The Senate recedes with an amendment which reduces the cost of the hospital to an amount which the conferees agree is sufficient to construct an adequate facility (hospitals generally are dealt with later in this report).

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio: At this installation, as at the one immediately above, the House authorized the construction of a hospital while the Senate deleted the item. The Senate recedes with an amendment which reduces the cost of the hospital.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: The House authorized the construction of a photographic laboratory at this installation, the facility to be used by MATS in connection with their mapping activities. The Senate deleted the item, and the House recedes.

George Air Force Base, Calif.: As in the other installations previously cited, the House approved but the Senate struck the hospital proposed for this installation. The conferees agreed upon a lower figure for the construction cost of the hospital, and the Senate recedes with an amendment.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, S.C.: Authority for an aircraft inspection and repair shop was granted by the House at this station. The Senate deleted the item. The Senate recedes.

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii: The House deleted the construction proposed for this facility but the requested authority was granted by the Senate. Based on further, more detailed, information supporting the granting of authority for this construction, the House recedes.

Various locations (Europe): The differences between the House and Senate figures in this case resulted from a number of internal changes and the deletion of a classified facility by the House. The conferees upon reexamination of the classified items proposed, agreed that the authority requested should be granted, and the House recedes.

Section 302: This variance between the House and Senate represents the largest difference between the House and Senate versions in title III. The resultant lower figure which was that granted by the Senate is in consonance with the new antiaircraft defense plan submitted by Secretary of Defense McElroy, and the House for this reason recedes.

Section 303: This section is identical in its language with section 103 which is described in detail under the Army title (sec. 103). For the reasons cited under the Army title the conferees agreed to an authority in the amount of $10,000,000, and the Senate recedes with an amendment.

Capehart housing: There were a substantial number of variances between the House and Senate versions of title III with respect to line items for Capehart family housing. Many of them reflected plans of the Air Force which were not complete at the time the House was considering the bill. After review of the housing needs at the various installations involved the House accepted all of the changes, except that relating to Charleston AFB, S.C., made by the Senate, with the conferees also agreeing that the limitation of 20,000 units for the coming 15 months would remain in the bill.

Section 307: No section similar to this appeared in the House version of the bill. The section would require that all contracts for acquisitions of real estate, grading, landscaping, construction, alteration, etc., at the Air Force Academy which provided for an expenditure in excess of $25,000 would require specific legislation to be enacted hereafter. After a review by the conferees of the status of the construction program of the Air Force Academy it was determined that this provision would not serve a useful purpose and it was deleted, with the Senate receding.

A new section 307 was inserted by the conferees reading as follows:

"SEC. 307. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to make a study of the need for grade separation on "Old Loop No. 13" which traverses a portion of Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. Expenditure of $25,000 out of appropriations available to the Department of the Air Force is authorized for such study."

Title IV

General Provisions

Many of the general provisions are identical to those which appeared in previous military construction laws and with respect to these there was no disagreement between the Senate and House versions of the bill.

Variations in the general provisions between the two versions of the bill are as follows:

Section 406: This section preserves certain authorities which would otherwise expire under the law. Among them is subsection (i) dealing with authorization for a hospital at Fort Jackson, S.C. The Senate had agreed to the preservation of this authority but had limited the per-bed cost of the hospital to $16,000. The conferees agreed that the bed cost at this hospital should be brought into general conformity with similar costs at other hospitals and changed the $16,000 figure to $20,000.

Section 408: This section corresponds to section 512 of Public Law 85–685 and would amend section 406 of Public Law 85–241 so as to exempt one additional category of family housing—i.e., rental-guarantee housing, from the present requirement for inclusion in the annual Military Construction Act.

The only difference between the House and Senate versions was the addition by the Senate of a limitation restricting the number of rental-guarantee units to be contracted for to not more than 5,000 units prior to June 30, 1964. The House recedes.

Section 409: This section which relates to the leasing of property in the Ryukyu Islands (Okinawa) did not appear in the House version of the bill. The plans of the Department of Defense with respect to the authority requested in this section had not matured until after House action had been taken on the bill. The House recedes.

Section 412: The House version of the bill contained no provision similar to this. The Senate inserted a provision which would have prevented the appropriation of any funds after December 31, 1959, to or for the use of any armed forces for the design, development, or procurement of aircraft or missiles unless the appropriation of such funds had

been specifically authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

The conferees agreed that the words "design" and "development" should be stricken from the language and that it be directed solely to the procurement of aircraft and missiles. The conferees also agreed that the date after which authorizing legislation would be necessary should be changed from December 31, 1959, to December 31, 1960. Also inserted by the conferees was a similar requirement with respect to naval vessels.

The conferees are in agreement that proper discharge of the legislative responsibilities of the Armed Services Committees requires an authorization of the aircraft, missile, and naval vessel procurement programs and that a thorough examination of these areas might serve to reduce the enormous cost of defense and be of assistance to the Committees on Appropriations in their consideration of the defense budget.

To implement this agreement, the conferees agreed to insert a new section 412 which will require the submission to the two Houses of a detailed statement with respect to those portions of the budget which relate to the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and also with respect to the procurement currently being made in these areas.

The new section, therefore, will give the two committees a year within which to make such internal changes in their committee structure as may be necessary and to study the field of aircraft, missile, and naval vessel procurement. After this year of preparation, the committees will then be ready to function in the legislative area and will be prepared to submit to their respective Houses soundly conceived and clearly presented programs for legislative consideration.

The conferees wish to point out that in referring to "aircraft," "missiles," and "naval vessels" it intends to refer only to operational aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels since it is to procurement in this area that the committees are directing this new requirement for specific legislative authorization.

The conferees cannot overemphasize their concern over the large expenditures entailed in procurement of aircraft and missiles under the existing broad statutory authorization, as well as the associated expenditures generated in other major budget categories. The conferees agreed that an effective method for maintaining proper surveillance over this procurement would be in the manner described above. The Senate recedes with an amendment.

Section 413: This section was added by the Senate committee since attention had recently been drawn to the fact that rectification and deepening of the Houston ship channel will require the use of certain areas which lie within the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot. The ordnance depot is being disposed of by the General Services Administration and this section will exclude from the disposal the areas needed for the deepening and rectification of the channel. Planning with respect to this matter had not matured prior to completion of action on the bill by the House. The House recedes.

Section 414: This section, which extends the Capehart Family Housing Act until September 30, 1960, and limits the number of Capehart housing units to an additional 20,000 units during the coming year, was inserted by the Senate committee. Since the President vetoed S. 57, the Housing Act of 1960, the inclusion of the extension of the Capehart Act was indeed provident. The House conferees had no objection to this extension nor to the limitation imposed. The House recedes.

Section 415: The Senate committee during its consideration of the bill inserted language which would have substituted the Government for the title insurance companies in performing functions relating to real property on which Capehart housing is proposed for construction.

The conferees agreed that the Senate language should remain in the bill but should be modified by a proviso which permits the Secretary of Defense to expend funds for title insurance if it is found impossible to finance the construction of a Capehart project without this action. The proviso also grants authority for the use of the Wherry Housing revolving fund to pay the cost involved in obtaining title search and title insurance.

In the utilization of this additional authority, a requirement is imposed that the Committees on Armed Services be promptly notified of each determination by the Secretary of Defense, in this area.

Section 418: This section, which was inserted by the Senate, amends section 404(c)(2) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 in such fashion as to require that the deposit made into the Registry of the Court in condemnation proceedings involving Wherry housing shall be an amount truly representative of the Wherry owner's equity in the project. The section details how this end will be achieved. This section would also provide that where the condemnee draws out of the Registry of the Court an amount greater than the value of the property as ultimately determined by the court, he shall pay to the Government 4 percent per annum on such excess from the time such sum was deposited in the Registry of the Court. The House recedes.

Section 419: In the House version of the bill, there was no section corresponding to Section 419. The Senate inserted language which would require that the Secretary of Defense report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House with respect to several individual elements relating to air defense.

The conferees agreed that a new section be inserted requiring that the Secretary of Defense report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of a complete review of all previously authorized surface-to-air missile sites. The report on this review is to provide assurance that the review revealed the military necessity for the construction of the sites selected; that the performance and capability of the missiles selected for the respective sites are in consonance with the military requirements, so as to eliminate, so far as is possible, any overlapping of missions or duplication of weapons systems.

The new section will require also that the report devote particular attention to the feasibility or desirability of modifying or expediting any of the missile programs for either defense or offense. The Senate recedes with an amendment.

Section 420: This section, which had no corresponding language in the House version of the bill, would authorize the use of funds generated by surplus commodity disposals to be used for military construction generally rather than for family housing and community facilities alone, which is the case today. As worded in the Senate version of the bill, the authorization would apply only to projects authorized by this act. The conferees agreed to modify this language so as to give it application to "any project authorized by law."

Hospitals

During the consideration of the construction bill in the Senate, six hospitals which had been approved by the House were stricken from the bill until, as the Senate report stated, "more realistic cost estimates are forthcoming * * *." The Senate committee stated in the report that it did not intend to imply that these hospitals are not needed, but simply that cost estimates appear to be entirely unrealistic. Subsequent to the Senate consideration of the bill, the Department of Defense submitted further cost estimates on the hospitals which were somewhat lower than those set out in the bill. The conferees were of the view that the costs still could be considered to be too high, and they, therefore, reduced the cost of all of the hospitals by approximately $2½ million.

These projects have been approved; however, it is expected that further investigations by the Department of Defense and the military departments concerned will be made with a view to effecting further savings within the totals whenever practicable. The investigation should include a review of the necessity for the planned mobilization expansion as well as the need for providing additional space for emergency expansion to care for a large input of patients due to unforeseen circumstances such as epidemics and catastrophes.

Revised Plan for Air Continental Defense

The revised plan which is referred to in the Statement in both titles I and III resulted in substantial reductions in these two titles. The plan provides for a reduction and revision in the planned deployment of both BOMARC and NIKE-HERCULES missile sites, and a revision and strengthening of the electronic ground environment so necessary to the control of the weapons and the air battle.

The BOMARC deployment will be on the perimeter of the east and west coasts and the Canadian border. This deployment is in keeping with the Furnas report. The NIKE defenses will continue to provide for the urban areas now protected, and will be extended to certain carefully selected Strategic Air Command sites. Although it does not affect the military construction authorization bill, the plan further provides for putting more funds, some $137 million, into the NIKE-ZEUS anti-missile-missile program for engineering development type of work.

Use of Prior Authorizations

The conferees wish to point out that among the deletions from the program contained in the bill are certain items for which there is a continuing construction requirement to adequately protect certain Strategic Air Command bases and other existing missile sites. It is proposed that this construction will be performed under authorization granted in the fiscal year 1959 law. It is desired, therefore, to make it a matter of record that authority for construction granted by Public Law 85-685 may be used to construct the items referred to above with the specific understanding that there will be construction for no more than 15 new SAC base defenses.

Title V

Reserve Forces Facilities

Under the Senate amendments to the Reserve Forces facilities title of the military construction bill, $57,695,000 was authorized for Reserve facilities projects, whereas the bill as passed by the House provided $57,128,000 for such projects, resulting in a difference of $567,000 in authorization authority.

Although the total dollar authorization contained in the House and Senate version are somewhat different, the Senate version rescinded previous authorizations in the amount of $1,251,000, whereas the House version rescinded only $628,000 of previous authorization. Thus, the actual net difference in the total new authorization was limited to $56,000 and therefore the House and Senate bills provided an almost identical amount of new dollar authorization for Reserve Forces facilities.

Inasmuch as the changes made in the amounts of new authorization and rescissions of previously granted authorization were almost entirely made at the request of the Department of Defense and the National Guard Bureau, the House recedes from its position and accepts the Senate substitutions.

Differences in Dollar Authorizations

As the bill passed the House, the authorities granted in the Army, Navy, Air Force,

and Reserve components titles totaled $1,252,608,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version of the bill totaled $1,211,480,000 or $41,128,000 less than the House version. The total agreed to by the conferees for titles I, II, III, and V is $1,225,475,150. This latter sum is $27,132,850 less than the House version and $13,995,150 more than the Senate version.

CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
L. C. ARENDS,
L. H. GAVIN,
WALTER NORBLAD,
FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MAINTENANCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES OF JUDGES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2902) relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the first paragraph of section 456 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'Each Justice or judge of the United States and each retired Justice or judge recalled or designated and assigned to active duty, while attending court or transacting official business at a place other than his official station, shall, upon his certificate, be paid by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts all necessary traveling expenses, and also a per diem allowance in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, 63 Stat. 166; 5 U.S.C. 835) at the per diem rate provided for by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, or, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts with the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States, reimbursement for his actual expenses of subsistence not in excess of the maximum amount fixed by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the legislative business and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 1 hour on the President's veto message on housing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—PRIVATE CALENDAR TO BE CALLED ON AUGUST 11

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with and that it may be in order to call the Private Calendar on August 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H.R. 8385) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the engrossed copy of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with?

The SPEAKER. It would be. Does the gentleman submit such a request?

Mr. TABER. I do.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8385 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 279, nays 136, answered "present" 2, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—279

Addonizio	Aspinall	Bass, N.H.
Anderson, Mont.	Avery	Bates
Anfuso	Ayres	Baumhart
Arends	Baker	Becker
Ashley	Baldwin	Beckworth
	Barrett	Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik	Griffiths	Nelsen
Boggs	Gubser	Nix
Boland	Hagen	Norblad
Bolling	Halleck	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolton	Halpern	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bowles	Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.
Boyle	Hays	O'Hara, Mich.
Brademas	Healey	O'Neill
Breeding	Hébert	Oliver
Brewster	Hechler	Osmers
Brooks, Tex.	Herlong	Ostertag
Broomfield	Hess	Passman
Broyhill	Holifield	Pelly
Burdick	Holland	Perkins
Burke, Ky.	Holtzman	Philbin
Burke, Mass.	Horan	Pillion
Bush	Hosmer	Pirnie
Byrne, Pa.	Huddleston	Porter
Byrnes, Wis.	Ikard	Powell
Cahill	Irwin	Price
Carnahan	Jackson	Prokop
Carter	Jarman	Pucinski
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Quie
Chamberlain	Johnson, Colo.	Quigley
Chelf	Johnson, Md.	Rains
Chenoweth	Johnson, Wis.	Randall
Chiperfield	Jones, Ala.	Ray
Clark	Jones, Mo.	Reuss
Coad	Judd	Rhodes, Ariz.
Coffin	Karsten	Rhodes, Pa.
Cohelan	Karth	Riehlman
Conte	Kasem	Rivers, Alaska
Cook	Kastenmeier	Roberts
Cooley	Kearns	Robison
Corbett	Kee	Rodino
Cramer	Keith	Rogers, Colo.
Curtin	Kelly	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis, Mass.	Keogh	Rooney
Daddario	Kilday	Roosevelt
Dague	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Daniels	King, Utah	St. George
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Santangelo
Dawson	Kluczynski	Saund
Delaney	Kowalski	Schenck
Denton	Laird	Schwengel
Derounian	Lane	Selden
Diggs	Langen	Shelley
Dingell	Lankford	Simpson, Pa.
Dixon	Lesinski	Sisk
Dollinger	Levering	Slack
Donohue	Libonati	Smith, Iowa
Dooley	Lindsay	Smith, Miss.
Dorn, N.Y.	Loser	Spence
Downing	McCormack	Springer
Doyle	McDowell	Staggers
Dulski	McFall	Stratton
Durham	McGinley	Stubblefield
Dwyer	McGovern	Sullivan
Edmondson	Macdonald	Taber
Elliott	Machrowicz	Taylor
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Fallon	Madden	Teller
Farbstein	Magnuson	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Mahon	Thornberry
Feighan	Mailliard	Toll
Fenton	Marshall	Tollefson
Fino	Martin	Trimble
Flood	Matthews	Udall
Flynn	May	Ullman
Fogarty	Meader	Vanik
Foley	Merrow	Van Zandt
Forand	Metcalf	Vinson
Ford	Meyer	Wainwright
Frazier	Miller, Clem	Wallhauser
Frelinghuysen	Miller, George P.	Walter
Friedel	Miller, N.Y.	Watts
Fulton	Milliken	Weis
Gallagher	Mills	Westland
Garmatz	Moeller	Widnall
Gary	Monagan	Wier
George	Montoya	Wilson
Giaimo	Moorhead	Wolf
Glenn	Morgan	Wright
Goodell	Morris, N. Mex.	Yates
Granahan	Multer	Younger
Green, Oreg.	Murphy	Zablocki
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Zelenko
Griffin		

NAYS—136

Abbitt	Barden	Bray
Abernethy	Baring	Brock
Adair	Barr	Brooks, La.
Alexander	Bass, Tenn.	Brown, Ga.
Alford	Belcher	Brown, Mo.
Alger	Bennett, Mich.	Brown, Ohio
Allen	Bentley	Budge
Andersen, Minn.	Berry	Burleson
	Betts	Cannon
Andrews	Bonner	Casey
Ashmore	Bosch	Cederberg
Bailey	Bow	Church

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 31, 1959
For actions of July 30, 1959
86th-1st, No. 129

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....15
Adjournment.....16,28
Agricultural sciences...19
Annuities.....10
Appropriations..1,17,18,27
Atomic energy.....41
Banking.....7,15
Budget.....21
Buildings.....4
Casein imports.....12
Civil defense.....17
Civil service.....48
Commissions.....2
Conservation.....27
Credit unions.....8,49
Development Loan Fund...56
Disaster relief.....15
Distressed areas.....37
Durum wheat.....27
Economic growth.....55
Education.....44
Electrification.....32,47
Executive privilege.....22
Farm program.....30
Farm City Week.....43
Food stamps.....36
Foreign affairs.....19,44
Foreign aid.....9,29,54
Foreign currencies.....6
Foreign trade.....9,20
Forestry.....26
Housing.....14
Information.....22
Interest rates.....31
Intergovernmental relations.....2,52
Lands.....5,27
Legislative program..15,27
Libraries.....51
Livestock.....38
Loans.....7
Meat grading.....40
Milk.....15,34
Organization.....56
Payrolling.....11
Personnel.....10,21,48,53
Poultry.....42
Public debt.....13
Public Law 480..6,20,27,36
Purchasing.....23,46
Reclamation.....25
Recreation.....26
Research.....3,19,45
Rural development.....33
Small business.....46
Statehood.....35
Surplus commodities.....20
Surplus food.....29,54
Surplus property.....51
Taxation.....10,24
Transportation.....24,50
Wheat.....27,39

HIGHLIGHTS: See page 7.

HOUSE

1. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6769, and acted on amendments which had been reported in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13442-4, 13450-2, 13466-75

2. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Government Operations Committee voted to report, amended, (but did not actually report) H. R. 6904, to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (p. D692). The Committee was authorized to file its report until midnight tonight, July 31 (p. 13486).

3. RESEARCH. The Science and Astronautics Committee reported with amendment H. R. 8284, to make various amendments to the National Science Foundation Act (H. Rept. 740). p. 13563

4. BUILDINGS. Received from GSA a report on lease agreements which do not bind the Government for periods in excess of 10 years which were entered into Jan. 2, 1959, through June 30, 1959 (p. 13563).

5. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 5412, to amend the Recreation Act of 1926 to provide that lands conveyed under such Act for State park purposes shall not be subject to the 640-acre limitation (H. Rept. 738). p. 13563

6. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5674, the military construction bill which includes authority for the use of Public Law 480 foreign currencies. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13441-2, 13449-50, 13475-9

7. LOANS; BANKING. Passed without amendment H. R. 8160, to liberalize in several respects the limitations on borrowing and lending by national banks (see Digest 124 for summary of bill). pp. 13479-80, 13490-4

Passed without amendment H. R. 8159, to amend the national banking laws to clarify or eliminate ambiguities, repeal obsolete provisions (including provisions for national agricultural credit corporations), etc. pp. 13480-90

8. CREDIT UNIONS. Passed without amendment H. R. 8305, to make various amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act, including provisions to increase the maximum maturities of loans from 3 to 5 years, increase signature loan limits from $400 to $1,000, etc. pp. 13479, 13494-511

9. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Bailey charged that most of the big newspapers have a "strong bias toward the free-trade policy of the executive branch" and that this attitude is reflected in their news items. Several Representatives discussed this matter. pp. 13522-34

Rep. Curtis, Mo., inserted and discussed tables which, he said, indicate that the foreign aid program is resulting in increased foreign trade. pp. 13547-52

10. PERSONNEL. The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 135, to provide an income tax credit in the case of civil-service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business with the U. S. p. D693

11. PAYROLLING. The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 3151, providing for withholding, for taxes by cities of 75,000 or more population, of Federal salaries. p. D693

12. CASEIN IMPORTS. The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7456, to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of casein. p. D693

13. PUBLIC DEBT. Rep. Reuss defended the Ways and Means Committee's policy regarding management of the Federal debt, etc., against criticisms from the Federal Reserve Board, etc. pp. 13544-7

14. HOUSING. Rep. Rains criticized the President's veto of the housing bill. pp. 13514-22

15. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Majority Leader McCormack announced next week's program as follows: Mon., Consent Calendar and suspensions including S. 1512, regarding Federal land banks; H. R. 7740, on acreage history and allotments; H. R. 6861, providing for State contributions to disaster relief; and S. 1289, extending the special milk program. Tues. and until terminated (if a rule is reported), the labor-management bill. p. 13466

Today I made a statement in the form of a press release suggesting that the Soviet Union be permitted to own and operate radio broadcasting stations in the United States, provided we were permitted to do the same thing in Russia. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, July 30.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH proposed today that the United States permit the Soviet Union to own and operate radio and television broadcasting stations in this country if we may do the same in Russia.

"Vice President NIXON put his finger on what is perhaps the most important difference between American truth and Russian Pravda yesterday when he criticized the Kremlin for its practice of jamming U.S. broadcasts," Senator BUSH said in a statement issued from his office.

"The Vice President was suggesting that freedom of speech could, better than anything else, lead to understanding between people. Mr. Khrushchev himself, in his telecast repartee with the Vice President, best demonstrated the need for such understanding when he expressed fear that his remarks might not be given a full and honest translation into English when broadcast in this country, which of course they were.

"These expressions by the visiting Vice President and his Kremlin host lead me to suggest a simple exchange of facilities which could open new doors of free speech and mutual respect and understanding between our two nations. I believe this is a fruitful time for us to make available to the U.S.S.R. important television and radio facilities in our country, fully owned and operated by Soviet personnel, if the United States is given similar facilities, under our full control, in Russia.

"Stations operated in the English language by Russians could bring to Americans the full picture of Soviet progress, information and ideas. Our American stations, in Russia, could present, in their language, the full and true story of our American culture, prosperity, and philosophy.

"With the Russians claiming the same dedication to peace that motivates our American diplomacy, this audio-visual exchanging of viewpoints and environments would inspire a truly wholesome competitive race for an increasingly better way of life for people everywhere. It should lead to an Olympics in ideology rivaling in friendly competitive atmosphere the great sports events between nations, with the world as a stadium.

"How much better and more effective this would be than the current arms race."

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in an attempt to accommodate all Members of the Senate, since we will have several rollcalls this afternoon, it appears that at this point it might be desirable to have the conference report on military construction authorization called up, and after it is called up the Senator from Mississippi informs me that he will make a very brief statement on it, and then we can have the yeas and nays ordered on it.

We would then like to call up the Health, Education, and Welfare conference report and have the yeas and nays ordered on it.

Then if there is further discussion in connection with the motion affecting the independent offices motion appropriation bill, or the military construction bill conference report or the HEW conference report, it could take place prior to the consecutive votes.

When we start to have the yeas and nays, we could have the votes follow each other so that Senators will not have to come to the Chamber and then return to their offices.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi be recognized to submit the conference report on the military construction authorization, report No. 729.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not rise to object, and I shall not object, but it seems to me that since we have completed the argument on the pending measure, the Senator from Texas might include in the unanimous-consent agreement that no further debate will take place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois would like to have 3 minutes on it, and I do not want to deprive him of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Excepting that it seems to me there would be no use in getting all the Senators here and then having the same debate all over again.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois says he will take only 3 minutes, and the Senator from Mississippi says he will take only 1 minute.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 29, 1959, pp. 13342–13351, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the conference report, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make on certain major points involved in the conference report.

The report was signed by all the conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, and has been agreed to by the House. With respect to the net money figures in the bill, there was only about a $14 million increase over the amount in the bill as passed by the Senate. This increase was primarily the result of reinserting in the bill a provision for six hospitals, which had been deleted by the Senate committee because it was felt the cost estimates were too high and unrealistic. It will be recalled that in the Senate committee's report it was pointed out that the committee did not question the need for the hospitals, but only questioned the cost estimates. The Department of Defense did subsequently submit revised figures in a lesser amount, and these were reduced still further by the conferees. It is believed much more realistic figures have now been arrived at, resulting in a substantial savings to the Government.

There are two or three language provisions which I should like to highlight. The first is section 412 of the bill. As the bill passed the Senate, this section would have prevented the appropriation of any funds after December 31, 1959, to or for the use of any armed forces for the design, development, or procurement of aircraft or missiles, unless the appropriation of such funds had been specifically authorized by legislation enacted after that date. It was agreed by the conferees that the words "design" and "development" should be stricken from the language, and that it be directed solely to the procurement of aircraft and missiles, and to include a similar requirement with respect to naval vessels. The conferees also agreed that the date after which authorization legislation would be necessary should be changed from December 31, 1959, to December 31, 1960. The conferees are in agreement that proper discharge of the legislative responsibilities of the Armed Services Committees required a review of these procurement programs, and that a thorough examination into these areas might serve to reduce the enormous cost of defense and be of assistance to the Committees on Appropriations in their consideration of the defense budget. The new section agreed to by the conferees will give the two committees a year to study the field of aircraft, missiles, and naval-vessel procurement, after which the committees will be ready to function in the legislative area and will be prepared to submit to their respective Houses soundly conceived and clearly presented programs for legislative consideration.

The next section I desire to mention is section 415. This section, as it passed the Senate, prohibits the use of mortgage proceeds for the purchase of title insurance and title search in connection with the construction of Capehart housing projects. The section provides that the Attorney General will furnish an opinion as to the sufficiency of title, and the Secretary of Defense will guarantee against any and all losses arising

against adverse claims to title. There is good authority, including the Comptroller General of the United States, to support the belief that this type of title search and title insurance by the Government is adequate, and should be acceptable to prospective mortgagees. A measure of uneasiness developed, however, in the minds of some of the Members of the Senate and the conferees, who feared that all prospective mortgagees might not readily distinguish between mortgages on Government property under full and complete guarantee by the United States, and private mortgages where commercial insurance may be a reasonable requirement. For this reason, the conferees added to the section a proviso allowing the Secretary of Defense to purchase commercial title search and insurance if he finds it impossible to secure the mortgages under the new policy established by section 415. However, any cost involved in the purchase of such insurance will be paid from appropriated funds already authorized for use by the Secretary of Defense, and not from mortgage proceeds upon which interest must be paid for a period of 25 years. A provision is made for surveillance by the Armed Services Committees.

Finally, I should like to call attention briefly to section 414 which extends the Capehart housing provisions of the National Housing Act to September 30, 1960, and limits to 20,000 units the number of Capehart units that may be contracted for until that time. Although there were substantial differences in the number of such units authorized in the House and Senate versions of the bill, many of them reflected plans of the Air Force that were not complete at the time when the House was considering the bill. The differences contained in the Senate bill were substantially agreed to, as well as the limitation on the number of units to be contracted for during the next 15 months.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the principal items in controversy were the ones the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has mentioned.

With respect to them, I should like to say that considerable concern was expressed by various Members about the provision on title insurance contained in the bill, as passed by the Senate. When the bill was before the Senate, I was among the Members who expressed the view that perhaps there should be some modification, so as to assure, on the one hand, that housing projects would be permitted to proceed, and, on the other hand, that if a title examination were necessary, there would be some method of paying for it without throwing the burden upon the insurance of the Capehart housing.

I think that double goal was reached by the language now in the conference report, although I should add that experience with the provision probably will be necessary before we know fully how it will affect the military housing program.

The second item I wish to mention is the provision for a review of the military program by the Secretary of Defense. As the military construction bill passed the Senate, it provided that there should be a review by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that it should be made known to both the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee. The resolving of the so-called controversy between the Nike-Hercules and the Bomarc programs resulted in a revision of the construction program and a provision for the submission by the Secretary of what was called a master plan.

Again, until that has been actually reviewed in the light of the experience in connection with the appropriations made available by the appropriations bill for the military construction program, there will not be the firm decisions which we have a right to expect.

The language contained in the conference report is not nearly so strong as I would have preferred to see used. It provides for a review by the Secretary of Defense, but there is not full assurance that that review will be participated in by the military chiefs.

Personally, I think Congress should have the assurance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the program is adequate to meet the defense posture which the country should have at this time.

I hope that when the review is provided by the Secretary of Defense, it will be consistent with the hopes expressed by various Members when the bill was under consideration.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has referred to the so-called Russell amendment—that is to say, the language which brings under review by the Congress the procurement programs for naval vessels, missiles, and aircraft. This is a big departure from anything we have had in our military procurement for many years.

The first review of this authorization will be somewhat experimental; but the Congress should obtain from it better control over the several programs involving missiles, naval vessels, and aircraft. It should result in the saving of money. It should result in better coordination of our military armaments and vessels and aircraft. I hope it will be successful. I believe it was an epochal step, insofar as military procurement is concerned.

The language used in the conference report was the subject of a considerable amount of discussion by the conferees. Several sessions were required in order to reach agreement on it. I believe it will be a useful instrument for the Congress in getting greater defense for the dollars we spend.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report; and I yield the floor.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the motion of Mr. YOUNG, of Ohio, that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1 to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished minority leader may now proceed for 3 minutes, and that then the Senate proceed to vote on the motion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] that the Senate recede from its position on the amendment No. 1, which is in disagreement.

I express the hope that the Senate by decisive vote will reject that motion, in which case of course the Senate will insist on its action to provide the extra funds necessary, in my opinion, in order to carry on the civil defense program.

One hundred and thirty-one million dollars of grant funds to the States has been invested for the purpose of setting up the civil-defense program, for which there is joint responsibility.

One year ago this month, as I recall, we had before us a $7 million item; and, before we adjourned, we scolded the civil-defense officials, on the ground that they had no well-worked-out program, no standards, and no merit system.

So now they have produced a merit system and a national plan and criteria for State plans—all of which have been submitted.

So today we have a national plan and State plans which have been submitted and approved; and they require the necessary funds, in order to articulate and carry out the program.

Are we now going to vote to waste the $131 million; or shall we provide sufficient funds to staff the program with the number of personnel and the kind of personnel needed?

I have given a good deal of attention to this matter. I believe I have stated the basic issue involved.

Therefore, Mr. President, I trust that the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] to have the Senate recede from its position on amendment No. 1 will be rejected by the Senate.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1960 — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] may call up the conference report on the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and may make a brief statement regarding it, and that thereafter we may request that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Senate will understand what they are being asked to vote on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Ohio is that the Senate recede from its position on amendment No. 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well. There will be at least 4 rollcalls, following this one, so I hope Members of the Senate will remain in the Chamber, and we shall conclude as quickly as we can.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. For the benefit of those who came to the Chamber late, would the Chair have the clerk state the amendment? It is a little difficult for us to know what we are being asked to vote on simply by a statement that it is a motion that the Senate recede.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk state the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the clerk will state the motion.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Amendment No. 1: On page 3, line 5, strike out "$10 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$25 million."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] that the Senate recede from its position on Senate amendment No. 1. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 71, as follows:

YEAS—12

Clark	Lausche	Neuberger
Douglas	Long	Russell
Gruening	McClellan	Yarborough
Hartke	Moss	Young, Ohio

NAYS—71

Allott	Hart	Monroney
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Beall	Hennings	Morton
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Prouty
Butler	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Robertson
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Jordan	Scott
Carroll	Keating	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smith
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Sparkman
Church	Kuchel	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Symington
Cotton	McCarthy	Talmadge
Curtis	McGee	Thurmond
Dirksen	McNamara	Wiley
Dworshak	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Martin	

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken	Engle	Green
Bartlett	Frear	Kerr
Chavez	Fulbright	Murray
Dodd	Goldwater	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Gore	Williams, N.J.

So the motion of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment No. 1 and request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference; and I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—76

Allott	Hartke	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Morton
Beall	Hennings	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Prouty
Butler	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Robertson
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Jordan	Scott
Carroll	Keating	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smith
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Sparkman
Chavez	Kuchel	Stennis
Church	Langer	Symington
Cooper	Lausche	Talmadge
Cotton	McCarthy	Thurmond
Curtis	McGee	Wiley
Dirksen	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Magnuson	Yarborough
Ellender	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Martin	
Hart	Monroney	

NAYS—8

Clark	Long	Russell
Douglas	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Moss	

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Frear	Kerr
Bartlett	Fulbright	Murray
Dodd	Goldwater	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Gore	Williams, N.J
Engle	Green	

So Mr. MAGNUSON's motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report on the military construction authorization bill, report No. 729, H.R. 5674.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the conference report on the military construction authorization bill. The adoption of the report is recommended by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The report is unanimous. The debate has been concluded, and the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report on this question. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—85

Allott	Dirksen	Kefauver
Anderson	Douglas	Kennedy
Beall	Dworshak	Kuchel
Bennett	Ellender	Langer
Bible	Engle	Lausche
Bridges	Ervin	Long
Bush	Gruening	McCarthy
Butler	Hart	McClellan
Byrd, Va.	Hartke	McGee
Byrd, W. Va.	Hayden	McNamara
Cannon	Hennings	Magnuson
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Mansfield
Carlson	Hill	Martin
Carroll	Holland	Monroney
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Morton
Chavez	Jackson	Moss
Church	Javits	Mundt
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Muskie
Cooper	Johnston, S.C.	Neuberger
Cotton	Jordan	Pastore
Curtis	Keating	Prouty
Proxmire	Smathers	Wiley
Randolph	Smith	Williams, Del.
Robertson	Sparkman	Yarborough
Russell	Stennis	Young, N. Dak.
Saltonstall	Symington	Young, Ohio
Schoeppel	Talmadge	
Scott	Thurmond	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—13

Aiken	Fulbright	Murray
Bartlett	Goldwater	O'Mahoney
Dodd	Gore	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Green	
Frear	Kerr	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LABOR DEPARTMENT AND DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I rise to a point of information. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to the conference report on the appropriation bill (H.R. 6769) for the Departments of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare, as presented by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Will the Senator from Alabama state by how much the appropriation is over the amount asked for in the budget?

Mr. HILL. It is $259 million over the budget estimate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—69

Allott	Hill	Moss
Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Beall	Humphrey	Muskie
Bennett	Jackson	Neuberger
Bible	Javits	Pastore
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston, S.C.	Proxmire
Cannon	Jordan	Randolph
Carlson	Keating	Robertson
Carroll	Kefauver	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Church	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Clark	Langer	Scott
Cooper	Long	Smathers
Douglas	McCarthy	Smith
Dworshak	McClellan	Sparkman
Ellender	McGee	Stennis
Engle	McNamara	Symington
Ervin	Magnuson	Talmadge
Gruening	Mansfield	Wiley
Hartke	Martin	Yarborough
Hayden	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hennings	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—14

Bush	Cotton	Lausche
Butler	Curtis	Morton
Byrd, Va.	Dirksen	Thurmond
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Williams, Del.
Case, N.J.	Hruska	

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken	Frear	Hart
Bartlett	Fulbright	Kerr
Chavez	Goldwater	Murray
Dodd	Gore	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Green	Williams, N.J.

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

(The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6769, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.
July 30, 1959.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 21, 40, 42, 43, and 44 to the bill (H.R. 6769) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "continuation" in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "expansion and improvement."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following:

cannot economically meet the changing needs of various units of the Laboratory. Some have proved dependable, but this means of obtaining animals is very expensive in the overall. The increasing need has made these stopgap arrangements unsatisfactory. Accordingly, plans have ben drawn up for an adequate animal production facility.

The proposed building would be approximately 160 by 50 feet, cement slab, single story, cinder block or tile veneer of the simplest type and design and one which would afford the most space for the least money. Cost of the basic construction, including the essential mechanical and service installations such as cage-washing facilities needed in the operation of the building, is estimated at $150,000. The utilities, including heat for the building, would be supplied by connection to the existing steam and power sources of the Laboratory. The building would be constructed on land which belongs to the United States Government and is a part of the present 19-acre plot on which the Rocky Mountain Laboratory is located.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1960

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is a very lengthy statement and has already been printed, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman is going to yield time to explain the conference report?

Mr. VINSON. I will accede to the requests that have been made and will explain the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 29, 1959.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1959, the House passed H.R. 5674, which was the fiscal year 1960 military construction authorization for the three military departments and for the Reserve components.

On June 30 the Senate considered the House bill and amended it by striking all language after the enacting clause and inserting a new bill.

As the bill passed the House, the authorities granted in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Reserve components titles totaled $1,252,608,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version of the bill totaled $1,211,480,000 or $41,128,000 less than the House version. The total agreed to by the conferees for titles I, II, III, and V is $1,225,475,150. This latter sum is $27,132,850 less than the House version and $13,995,150 more than the Senate version.

As is usual, there were many items in disagreement between the House and Senate versions. Most of these, I am happy to say were matters of minor importance. There were, however, several substantial differences, both in money amounts and in the language of the general provisions, and I would like to describe these differences briefly in order that the House may know what its conferees have agreed to.

First, the Senate cut from the House bill all authority for six hospitals, two for the Army, one for the Navy, and three for the Air Force. The Senate report on its bill indicated quite clearly that the cuts were made not on the basis that the hospitals were not really needed, but rather that the costs of the hospitals appeared to that body to be excessive.

The total cost of these hospitals as submitted by the Department was about $19,200,000. The House conferees initiated an independent study of the hospitals and arrived at a lower figure. I think it of interest to know that the Senate conferees on an entirely independent basis made a similar study. Each of these studies was made without the knowledge that the other body was engaged in the same pursuit.

As I said, the total cost of the hospitals originally was about $19,200,000. The two independent studies resulted in a total difference between the House and the Senate of only $98,000, which is less than one-half of 1 percent difference. I think that the two studies were profitable, and I believe that with some cutting here and there that the hospitals can be built for the new, lower figure. The new figure is a little over $16,500,000. This is $2,600,000 less than the Department's original estimates.

The six hospitals was, therefore, reinserted in the program at the lower figures.

The next substantial reduction made by the Senate related to both the Army and Air Force titles and directed itself to the matter of our air defense.

The House is aware that Secretary McElroy initiated a completely new study of our air defense and arrived at certain conclusions which will permit the use of both of the principal weapons systems which have been planned while at the same time making internal modifications which permit reductions in the authorization contained in this bill.

In the Army title the reduction was a little over $17 million, while in the Air Force title the reduction was about $29 million.

I, of course, cannot go into the details of this plan since it involves highly classified information, but I can assure the House that both Nike-Hercules and Bomarc will remain in our inventory and perform the functions originally planned for them in substantially the same fashion that we are already familiar with.

An individual item of interest is the authorization requested for the establishment of Norad headquarters at Colorado Springs, Colo. The House struck this item from the bill since its location has not been determined at the time of House consideration. Shortly after this time, however, the location of the headquarters was specifically determined and the Senate inserted the required authorization in the bill. The House conferees agreed that the authorization should now be granted and the agreed item appears in the conference report.

Many of the general provisions appear in this bill year after year, and with respect to these there was, of course, no disagreement.

One of the general provisions which has not appeared in the bill before is section 409 which would grant certain necessary authority for the leasing of property in Okinawa. This was inserted by the Senate but only because plans with respect to this program had not matured at the time the House was considering the bill.

Section 414 will extend the Capehart Family Housing Act. This was inserted by the Senate and it was, indeed, provident in view of the President's veto of the housing bill. This same section also limits the number of Capehart houses to be constructed during the coming year to 20,000. This, I think, is a sound provision since it will require the Department of Defense to take an even closer look at its family housing program to insure that there is no overbuilding at military installations throughout the United States.

I might say in this connection that there are a great number of self-imposed limitations now controlling the construction of Capehart houses, and I feel that these, coupled with the overall imposition of a numerical ceiling, will give us an assurance that only housing that is really needed will be built.

Another section, number 418, which was inserted by the Senate, strives to assure that the deposits made in Wherry condemnations will actually be equal to the Wherry sponsor's equity. There has been some difficulty on this score in the

past, and I feel that this section may well help the situation.

Section 420 will permit the use of funds generated through the disposal of surplus commodities to be used in overseas areas, not only for the construction of houses but for any military construction where use of surplus commodity funds is feasible. This, again, is a step in the right direction, and the House conferees were in full agreement with its inclusion in the final version of the bill.

Three other provisions which were in disagreement I have saved until the last since I consider them to be of considerable importance. I will now deal with these three provisions in the order of their importance.

The Senate committee inserted section 419 in the bill. The Senate language would have required a very detailed report to the Armed Services Committees relating to our air defense and related matters.

The report required by the Senate language would have included the opinion of the respective Chiefs of Staff in connection with one particular element of our defense posture.

Another part of it would have required the "latest opinion of the respective Chiefs of Staff" in connection with another area of judgment.

The House conferees, while agreeing that continuing review of matters important to our defense should be encouraged and, indeed, required, did not feel any view should be expressed other than by the man specifically charged by law with this responsibility. That man is the Secretary of Defense. Since all of the conferees, both Senate and House, were agreed in principle with the need for a review of certain elements of our defense situation, agreement was reached that a new section 419 would be inserted in the bill. The new section will require that the Secretary of Defense shall not later than September 15, 1959, report to the Senate and the House the results of a complete review of all previously authorized surface-to-air missile sites with the assurance, first, that the review reveals the military necessity for the construction of the sites selected; second, that the performance and capability of the missiles selected for the respective sites are in consonance with military requirements so as to eliminate any overlapping in this area; and third, that particular attention shall be given to the feasibility of modifying or expediting any of our missile programs.

This new section cannot fail to have an overall beneficial result. In the first place, it will insure a continuing review of these important matters by the Secretary of Defense and at the same time, provide the Congress with specific and detailed information which it must have in order to legislate intelligently.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. With reference to the title insurance section that you just described, you say if it cannot be obtained in any other manner or if the builder will not build without the title insurance section——

Mr. VINSON. May I interrupt—then they will have to have title insurance, and the new language also provides a source of funds for the procurement of title insurance, and that is the revolving fund established for procurement and improvement of Wherry housing projects.

Mr. McDONOUGH. At what rate of interest?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know what the gentleman is referring to. Interest rates are not involved.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is not provided for in the conference report?

Mr. VINSON. No. We do not deal with the question of interest at all.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What other source of funds is there besides title insurance, FHA funds, available in the conference report?

Mr. VINSON. This is the only place. Title insurance costs will come from the Wherry revolving fund. I will now continue with my detailed statement.

Section 415 was another addition by the Senate committee. This section relates to the procurement of title insurance with respect to property on which the construction of a Capehart housing project is planned.

As the Senate language was written, considerable fear was expressed that it would practically bring the Capehart housing program to a halt since it virtually forbade the procurement of title insurance.

Now, I think we can all agree that we cannot dictate to the insurance companies and the banks who lend the money for Capehart projects whether they will or will not have title insurance. It is entirely within their own discretion and best business judgment as to whether they will lend money for these projects. If they will not lend money without title insurance, then the Capehart project stops, and our military personnel are left without the family housing that they should have.

This particular provision was the subject of extended discussions by the conferees but the discussion finally turned out to be a profitable one from the standpoint of the House since the Senate language has now been modified so as to permit the procurement of title insurance if the construction of a Capehart project is impossible without it. Or, to put it another way, if the lenders will not lend without title insurance, then title insurance can be procured.

The new language also provides a source of funds for the procurement of title insurance and that is the revolving fund established for the procurement and improvement of the old Wherry housing projects.

So now we have an agreement, and I think it is a good one, that title insurance can be procured where it is necessary but will be eliminated where it is not necessary.

The last and most important section of the bill which I wish to discuss is section 412. This section relates to what I will call a line item authorization for missiles, aircraft, and naval vessels.

The language inserted by the Senate—and there was no counterpart in the House bill—would have required that no money could be appropriated after December 31, 1959, for the design, development, or procurement of aircraft or missiles unless the appropriation had been specifically authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

In effect, this meant that immediately at the beginning of the next session of this Congress, authorization would be necessary before any aircraft or missiles could be made the subject of an appropriation.

The conferees finally agreed, therefore, that the section should be modified in certain essential respects.

In the first place, the words "design" and "development" were deleted from the Senate language since it is actually operational procurement that should be the subject of any authorizing legislation.

Another very substantial change was the addition of a requirement that the same authorization must be provided for naval vessels.

Based on these considerations, the language was changed so that on or before January 31, 1960, the Secretary of Defense will submit to the Senate and the House complete and detailed information with respect to the various types and kinds of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels being procured by the Armed Forces, including the number of each type and kind and the cost thereof.

Also, the submission of the Secretary will include the cost and number of each type and kind of aircraft, missile, and vessel proposed to be procured and the estimated cost of them.

The rest of this new section reads as follows:

No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legisaltion enacted after such date.

Now, why should we provide in the law that aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels be the subject of an authorization bill?

Today, the Armed Services Committee hears the military construction bill which this year totals about $1.2 billion. We work hard on this bill and I think we provide the House all of the information which it needs to have in order to act intelligently on it.

The budget for the current fiscal year for aircraft and missiles is in the order of $9 billion. The shipbuilding appropriation request for this year is $1 billion.

This is a total of $10 billion. Let us look for a moment at the authorizations on which these appropriations are made.

In the case of the Navy, the basic authority is this:

The President may acquire, construct, or manufacture naval airplanes, spare parts, and equipment necessary to provide and maintain 15,000 useful naval airplanes.

Here is another similar Navy authority:

The Secretary of the Navy may procure and construct guided missiles.

The Air Force authority for its missiles and planes reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Air Force may procure guided missiles and 24,000 serviceable aircraft or 225,000 airframe tons of serviceable aircraft, whichever the Secretary considers appropriate.

Now, these authorities could not be broader unless the last remaining limitation was removed and that is the number of aircraft.

In the field of ship procurement, the situation is somewhat better but still is so broad today that the Armed Services Committees consider only a small fraction of the total shipbuilding program each year. This usually relates to antisubmarine vessels and other relatively minor ships which do not fall within the broad categories of the Vinson-Trammell Act.

And I might say that the Vinson-Trammell Act was passed 25 years ago this year—back in 1934. It, with its subsequent amendments, provided enough tonnage for the Navy to build ships for an untold number of years without any further authorization. All the Navy has needed and all it needs today is appropriations.

We are now bringing into the fold for the first time aircraft and missiles and returning to the fold ship construction.

I feel, and I think the House will agree with me, that the legislative committee—the committee which should be the policymaking committee—should have full and detailed information with respect to the tremendous expenditures involved in these programs. It is true that we could obtain the information at any time but, with the responsibility of enacting legislation, information tends to remain exactly that, just "information."

Let me cite a few figures:

A B–58 airplane costs about $12.5 million.

A Navy carrier fighter plane costs about $3.3 million.

An Atlas missile costs $2 million.

A Polaris submarine costs $100 million.

A Bomarc costs $873,000.

And a Nike-Hercules costs $78,500.

When you multiply each one of these by 100, or by several hundred, the cost is simply staggering.

Under the new section 412 of the bill, then, the Armed Services Committee will obtain all of the information which is now furnished the Appropriations Committee. It will consider it, study it, and bring a bill to the floor which will inform the House to the very maximum extent possible consistent with security considerations with respect to these areas of procurement.

The bill will leave research and development of our various weapons just as it is today. We are directing our attention at this time only to procurement of operational aircraft, missiles, and vessels.

I hope that I have given the House a complete picture of what the conferees have agreed upon. The bill contains some 2,000 items, it has been closely studied by the two Armed Services Committees and has been debated on the floor of each House.

The agreement reached by the conferees is, I think, well considered in all its aspects and warrants the support of every Member of the House.

Let me now deal with the subject of our air defense.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult problems which has faced both the Department of Defense and the Congress over the past several years is that of the air defense of the United States.

The problem confronting us today in providing adequate air defenses for the continental United States thus is one which requires the establishment and maintenance of an antiaircraft defensive system.

Controversy between manufacturers and the services over the relative merits and means of employment of antiaircraft weapons has added to the difficulty and confusion. This confusion is reflected in the actions of the House Appropriations Committee which, on the basis of its best judgment, deleted from the fiscal year 1960 Department of Defense appropriations bill a major portion of the money requested for the Bomarc weapon. Similarly, the Senate Armed Services Committee, at the one time, deleted from the bill presently under consideration, substantial authorization for future construction of Nike sites and also restricted the utilization of authority presently authorized and appropriated for this purpose.

The Secretary of Defense agreed with the Senate Appropriations Committee that a decision in this field was urgently necessary and that congressional action would be helpful to him in obtaining such a decision.

Under these circumstances, as the House is aware, the Secretary of Defense requested the Armed Services Committees of the House and of the other body to delay final action on the military construction bill, pending submission by him of an overall air defense plan. This request was agreed to by both committees of the Congress and the Secretary presented a plan to the Armed Services Committee of the other body on June 12. A few days later it was presented to the House Armed Services Committee.

The continental air defense plan, as presented by the Secretary of Defense, represents his best judgment as providing the means necessary to meet the present and future Russian manned bomber threat and at the same time makes provision for accelerating research and development in the anti-missile-missile field. It does not represent the corporate opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as they were unable to agree among themselves and submitted several recommendations which the Secretary of Defense undertook to resolve. The Secretary's final decision in this area was approved by the President.

Those features of the plan involved in the military construction bill were accepted substantially by the other body and are incorporated in the agreement of the managers on the part of the House in the conference report now under consideration.

Generally speaking, the action of the other body and the agreement of your conferees results in a reduction of both the Bomarc and Nike programs. It appeared to the committee of conference, however, that the level of defense recommended by the Secretary of Defense was approximately correct to meet the Russian manned-bomber threat as it presently exists and may be expected to continue for the foreseeable future.

Obviously, it is impossible for me in a public statement to give at this time all details of the plan. I believe I may say, however, without fear of revealing military secrets, that the plan is predicated upon a peripheral defense concept, incorporating three defensive lines along the western, northern, and eastern boundaries of the United States. Certainly it is to our advantage to destroy attacking enemy aircraft as far from our borders as possible, hence, the first defensive line consists of United States and Canadian interceptor aircraft.

A second line of long-range Bomarc missiles will be prepared to attack bombers which escape the interceptors, and finally, close-in defensive positions employing the Nike-Hercules and Nike-Ajax weapons surrounding key industrial centers and SAC bases will be available to attack such of the enemy as may penetrate both the interceptor and Bomarc defense systems.

It seems to me that the plan is a reasoned, intelligent and practical solution which employs the peculiar advantages of all weapons available to us to defend against enemy-manned bombers. It is true that Bomarc is an expensive weapon when compared to Nike but it is also true that it will destroy the enemy at a distance from our country which to me makes the additional cost worthwhile. Similarly, the Nike has advantages which make it more adaptable for close-in point defense and defense against low-flying aircraft. Both systems are supported by expansion and improvement of our early warning radar lines across the northern reaches of the North American Continent, and by improving and strengthening of the Sage system within the continental United States.

There remains simply the question of judgment, the answer to the question: "How much is enough?" On this question an honest difference of opinion exists among the several members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, among Members of the House of Representatives and among Members of the other body. I agree that a decision in this area was long overdue and I believe that the House of Representatives is entitled to credit for the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations and by the Armed Services Committee to expedite a decision of this vital and difficult question.

Nevertheless, that decision having been made by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the President, I, for one, would not care to substitute my individual judgment in a matter so vital

to our national survival for that of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and their military advisers.

The reduced programs for both Nike and Bomarc installations incorporated in the air defense plan will result in disappointment to some Members and to their constituents who had reason to believe that such installations would be constructed in their areas. Thus, two Bomarc bases, one in Vermont and one in Wisconsin, which has proceeded to the point of inviting bids for construction in one case, and where a contract had been granted in the other, already have been canceled. Similarly, with the exception of certain key SAC bases, new Nike-Hercules installations in the central and southern parts of the United States once planned, will not be built.

I believe I should say at this point that the decisions regarding the location of the sites of both Bomarc and Nike-Hercules weapons included in the air defense plan were made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the recommendations of the commander in chief, North American Air Defense Command. They were military decisions and represent the best judgment of military men for the location of these weapons.

Reduction of the numbers of sites in question, together with reduced procurement programs for the weapons to go on such sites, results in substantial savings in money over the original programs recommended for the Bomarc by the Air Force and for the Nike by the Army. These additional funds will be reflected in additional expenditures in the research and development test and evaluation of the Nike-Zeus, the anti-missile-missile. The Secretary of Defense also has requested of the Congress an additional $137 million for current obligation for the development and production of machines to mass-produce components of the Nike-Zeus system. Other funds available to ARPA also are being utilized in basic research for other anti-missile-missile defense systems.

I would like to say, generally, in connection with Nike and Bomarc sites, that section 419 of the bill as agreed upon by the conferees will require a study and review by the Secretary of Defense of all of the sites selected as a means of determining that the correct sites have been selected, and that military necessity dictates that they be established in those particular locations.

That study by the Secretary of Defense is to be completed and submitted to the Committee on Armed Services not later than September 15 of this year.

In view of that, it is possible, although I consider it improbable, that some revisions may be made in the sites already selected. In any event, no one can say as a matter of absolute certainty that this site will be built or will not be built. On September 15, however, I believe that we will be able to answer questions of this kind.

The air defense plan, as reflected in the construction agreed upon in this conference report, represents an adequate defense against the Russian manned-bomber threat as seen today and as it may continue in the foreseeable future. As this threat decreases the threat to our country from intercontinental ballistic missiles will increase. It is incumbent upon the administration and upon the Congress to assure that no stone is left unturned to solve the problem of defense against enemy ballistic missiles. You may be assured that the Armed Services Committee of the House is alert to this urgent requirement and will assert all of its influence as well as lend its full support toward the prompt solution of this new and dreadful threat to our liberty.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What action did the conference committee take, if any, with respect to the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot?

Mr. VINSON. We provided that 118 acres would be retained for channel straightening and that in addition some 400 acres would be used as an area for spoil disposal in the cleaning out of the channel.

Mr. GROSS. How many acres did the gentleman say?

Mr. VINSON. 118 acres for the channel straightening. We retain the title to that to straighten out the channel.

Mr. GROSS. And you make available for spoilage how many acres?

Mr. VINSON. 400 acres. The other phase of that disposal proposition was not in conference. That had passed and is the law.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that perfectly, but this means another dig into that valuable property.

Mr. VINSON. No. The acreages I mentioned are retained by the Government.

Mr. GROSS. How about the 118 acres?

Mr. VINSON. The Government retains it.

Mr. GROSS. That is 118 acres?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; the Government takes it out of the proposed disposal by GSA.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that was to be turned over for the straightening of the channel.

Mr. VINSON. We hold back the 118 acres, and we also hold back the 400 acres. That is what we are doing. In other words, we are reducing the amount that will be available for sale.

Mr. GROSS. The amount you originally set aside for that purpose perhaps you are reducing, but the fact remains that you are giving away some of this.

Mr. VINSON. The 518 acres are being retained. That is not involved here. We are holding back 118 acres to straighten the channel. We are taking back 400 acres for a spoilage area.

Mr. GROSS. How can you say you are taking back something that you have given away?

Mr. VINSON. Because we have already passed the bill permitting it to be sold. We are curtailing the blanket authorization.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman this question. Is anybody going to pay for this land that is given for the straightening of the Houston ship channel?

Mr. VINSON. It will belong to the Government. That is the Government's land. Nobody pays for it. The Government does not give it away.

Mr. GROSS. It is going to be given away for that purpose.

Mr. VINSON. It is not given away at all.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEOGH. I do appreciate the gentleman's reference in his statement to the new language of section 415. I take from the statement that he made that it is intended by the conferees that the proviso added to section 415 would apply to future projects.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. KEOGH. And that where those projects could not be concluded unless the lender requires either for himself or under State law a policy of title insurance, the Secretary is authorized to enter into that contract.

Mr. VINSON. If it is impossible for any reason to construct a Capehart house without title insurance then the Secretary is authorized by this language to obtain title insurance.

Mr. KEOGH. I should like, if I may, to direct the gentleman's attention to the situation I am told now exists. There are a number of such commitments that have been made. There have been requests for title insurance. The mortgages, however, have not closed. The policy of insurance has not been delivered. I assume that it is not the intention of this legislation to interfere with such existing contracts?

Mr. VINSON. I would say this. In view of the fact that the law as far as Capehart houses are concerned has expired, strictly speaking; everything relating thereto died and is dead today until this bill is passed. I would say that a wise Secretary might examine those applications, look them over, and if he felt that the facts and circumstances warranted title insurance he has the latitude here to insist on title insurance.

Mr. KEOGH. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I agree with the statements made by the chairman of the committee. I signed the conference report, as a member of the conference committee although possibly in one or two instances I had some grave doubts in my mind as to the workability of one or two such provisions in this conference report.

However, as a whole, our conferees have done an exceptionally good job and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 334) providing for the consideration of H.R. 8305, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8305) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to my colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 334 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 8305, which seeks to amend the Federal Credit Union Act. The resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 8305 would rewrite the Federal Credit Union Act, passed in 1934. A number of the amendments would clarify and modernize the act without making substantive changes. Among the more important substantive amendments are the following:

First. Increases maximum maturities of loans from 3 to 5 years.

Second. Increases signature loan limits from $400 to $1,000.

Third. Provides for loan officers to process loans within specified limits and makes other improvements in the organization of Federal credit unions to enable them to meet their members' needs more efficiently.

Fourth. Liberalizes borrowing restrictions on Federal credit union officials.

Fifth. Authorizes Federal credit unions to cash and sell checks to members for a reasonable fee.

Sixth. Authorizes dividends to be paid semiannually and allows dividend credit for savings received in the first 5 days of a month.

The bill would have no impact on the Federal budget inasmuch as the expenses incurred by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions are paid out of fees collected from the supervised credit unions.

Although the Federal Credit Union Act has proven to be a remarkably effective instrument during the 25 years in which it has operated, it has not kept pace in many respects with the changes in our economy and the evolving needs of credit unions and their members which have risen during this period. The House Banking and Currency Committee is recommending a series of specific amendments which are designed to bring the act in tune with today's economy.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the first State credit union law—and the 25th anniversary of the Federal Credit Union Act.

The first credit union in the United States was organized in 1909. The Federal Credit Union Act was passed in 1934.

Today there are more than 9,000 Federal credit unions operating in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including the District of Columbia—with a membership of over 5 million.

Although the Federal Credit Union Act has been law for only 25 of the 50 years credit unions have operated in the United States—almost half of the 20,000 credit unions which have been organized have been chartered by the Federal Government.

As of December 31, 1958, Federal credit unions had assets estimated at more than $2 billion and are growing at a rate of approximately $300 million each year. During the past 25 years, less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the dollar amount loans made by Federal credit unions have been charged off as losses.

This bill would rewrite the Federal Credit Union Act. A number of the amendments would clarify and modernize the act without making substantive changes.

Among the more important substantive amendments are the following:

First. Increases maximum maturities of loans from 3 to 5 years.

Second. Increases signature loan limits from $400 to $1,000.

Three. Provides for loan officers to process loans within specified limits and makes other improvements in the organization of Federal credit unions to enable them to meet their members' needs more efficiently.

Fourth. Liberalizes borrowing restrictions on Federal credit union officials.

Fifth. Authorizes Federal credit unions to cash and sell checks to members for a reasonable fee.

Sixth. Authorizes dividends to be paid semiannually, and allows dividend credit for savings received in the first 5 days of a month.

No impact on the Federal budget, inasmuch as the expenses incurred by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions are paid out of fees collected from the supervised credit unions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL BANK AMENDMENTS—AMENDING LENDING AND BORROWING LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO NATIONAL BANKS AND AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL DEPUTY COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 333) providing for the consideration of H.R. 8160, a bill to amend the lending and borrowing limitations applicable to national banks, to authorize the appointment of an additional Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, and for other purposes, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8160) to amend the lending and borrowing limitations applicable to national banks, to authorize the appointment of an additional Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] and I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 333 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 8160, which would amend the lending and borrowing limitations applicable to national banks and would authorize the appointment of an additional Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, among other things. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 8160 makes four basic changes in the laws relating to national banks. The first section provides for an additional Deputy Comptroller and increases the surety bonds for the Comptroller and the Deputy Comptrollers. Section 2 increases the limit on borrowing by national banks from 100 percent of capital to 100 percent of capital plus 50 percent of surplus. Section 3 relates to the limit on loans by national banks to one borrower. Section 4 liberalizes some of the restrictions on real estate loans by national banks. The bill would allow national banks to make real estate loans up to 20 years, covering up to 75 percent of

the appraised value of the real estate, if the loans are fully amortized. It would also permit loans on leaseholds that run at least 10 years beyond the loan maturity. Finally, it would relax certain existing restrictions on construction loans, exempt from the usual restrictions on real estate loans any loan fully guaranteed by a State or State authority, and allow a bank to take a mortgage as additional security on certain business loans without thereby becoming subject to the real estate loan restrictions.

The bill would have no impact on the Federal budget inasmuch as the expenses incurred by the Comptroller of the Currency in supervising national banks are obtained by assessment against the banks supervised.

H.R. 8160 supersedes H.R. 6092 which was amended by a subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. H.R. 8160, a clean bill, incorporates the changes made in the original bill.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill amends the lending and borrowing limitations applicable to national banks—to authorize the appointment of an additional Deputy Comptroller of the Currency—and for other purposes.

The bill makes four basic changes in the laws relating to national banks:

First. The first section relates to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which supervises national banks. It provides for an additional Deputy Comptroller and increases the surety bonds for the Comptroller and the Deputy Comptrollers.

There are presently three deputies—one was authorized in the original National Bank Act in 1863; the second was authorized in 1909; and the third in 1923.

The volume of work in the Comptroller's Office has been increasing for many years with the growth in national bank assets. In 1923, when the last Deputy Comptroller was authorized, the total assets of national banks were less than $22 billion—as of December 31, 1958, total assets had grown to over $128 billion.

The bill would raise the surety bond required for the Comptroller from $100,000 to $250,000; and for the Deputy Comptrollers from $50,000 to $100,000.

This action is not a reflection on any of the individuals now occupying these offices. The Comptroller's bond was fixed in 1863; and the Deputy Comptrollers' bonds, in 1909. These amounts are now obviously outmoded.

Second. Increases the limit on borrowing by national banks, from 100 percent of capital, to 100 percent of capital plus 50 percent of surplus.

This increase in borrowing authority will permit banks, particularly smaller banks subject to heavy seasonal demands, to meet more adequately the financial needs of their communities, and without unduly increasing the risk involved.

With this enlargement of borrowing power, national banks would still be subject to stricter limits than apply in many States, where State banks may borrow up to the amount of their capital and surplus, and in some instances greater amounts with the approval of the State bank supervisory authority.

Third. Section 3 relates to the limit on loans by national banks to one borrower.

Generally, the limit is now 10 percent of the bank's capital and surplus—but there are 12 exceptions permitting the national banks to make larger loans upon specified types of securities.

Under this bill, a 13th exception would be added, and three of the exceptions would be amended.

The three exceptions to be amended deal with loans secured by refrigerated or frozen foods, discounts by dealers in dairy cattle, loans secured by U.S. Government obligations.

The new exception deals exclusively with installment consumer paper and would apply to all such paper whether negotiable or nonnegotiable.

Fourth. Section 4 liberalizes some of the restrictions on real estate loans by national banks. This bill would allow national banks to make real estate loans up to 20 years, covering up to 75 percent of the appraised value of the real estate, if the loans are fully amortized. It would almost permit loans on leaseholds that run at least 10 years beyond the loan maturity. Finally, it would relax certain existing restrictions on construction loans, exempt from the usual restrictions on real estate loans any loan fully guaranteed by a State or State authority, and allow a bank to take a mortgage as additional security on certain business loans without thereby becoming subject to the real estate loan restrictions.

The bill would have no impact on the Federal budget, inasmuch as the expenses incurred by the Comptroller of the Currency in supervising national banks are obtained by assessment against the banks supervised.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL BANK AMENDMENTS AMENDING NATIONAL BANKING LAWS TO CLARIFY OR ELIMINATE AMBIGUITIES AND TO REPEAL CERTAIN LAWS WHICH HAVE BECOME OBSOLETE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 332) providing for the consideration of H.R. 8159, a bill to amend the national banking laws to clarify or eliminate ambiguities, to repeal certain laws which have become obsolete, and for other purposes, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8159) to amend the national banking laws to clarify or eliminate ambiguities, to repeal certain laws which have become obsolete, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 332 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 8159, relating to technical amendments in national bank laws. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 8159 is designed primarily to repeal various obsolete provisions of the national banking laws, to clarify and eliminate existing ambiguities, and to add new authority relating to, first, change of location of national banks; second, liabilities of national banks to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; third, length of time within which national banks must furnish condition reports; fourth, declaration of dividends of national banks; fifth, receipt of deposits by corporations not examined and regulated; and sixth, use of word "national" in title of national banks.

The bill would have no impact on the Federal budget inasmuch as the expenses incurred by the Comptroller of the Currency in supervising national banks are obtained by assessment against the banks supervised.

H.R. 8159 supersedes H.R. 6093 which was amended by a subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. H.R. 8159, a clean bill, incorporates the changes made in the original bill.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] and pending his use of that time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have placed on the Clerk's desk this morning and signed a discharge petition on the home rule bill. This afternoon during special orders the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will address themselves to this question. I urge Members interested to be on the floor at that time and participate in the discussion. I also urge all Members, who want home rule for the District of Columbia to sign the discharge petition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to speak out of order.)

Public Law 86-149
86th Congress, H. R. 5674
August 10, 1959

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Military Construction Act of 1959.

TITLE I

Sec. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Army.

Inside the United States

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and troop housing, $785,000.

Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $454,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,292,600.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $1,160,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities and troop housing, $414,000.

Columbus General Depot, Ohio: Utilities, $2,783,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $270,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development, and test facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $532,000.

73 STAT. 302.

73 STAT. 303.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $3,230,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, medical facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,376,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,285,500.

Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina: Family housing, $190,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Medical facilities and utilities, $188,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $59,000.
Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $64,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, $229,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,541,000.
Fort Meade, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,530,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,090,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,228,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $2,300,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $2,636,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, $238,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,260,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $840,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $5,337,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $160,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational facilities, medical
73 STAT. 303. facilities and utilities, $553,000.
73 STAT. 304. Army Support Center, St. Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $261,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Presidio of San Francisco, California; Utilities, $218,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Family housing and utilities, $6,303,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Greely: Family housing and community facilities, $2,395,000.
Fort Richardson: Training facilities, $321,000.

(Tactical Installations and Support Facilities)

Various locations: Family housing, $1,646,000.
Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $13,194,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Real estate, $90,000.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities and community facilities, $1,259,000.
Camp Buckner, Okinawa: Training facilities, $217,000.
Pacific Scatter System: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,104,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Training facilities, $228,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Training facilities, $140,000.
Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.
Italy: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,973,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, family housing, and utilities, $5,573,000.

(Strategic Army Communications)

Various locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,288,000.

Classified installations and facilities.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $81,830,000.

73 STAT. 304.
73 STAT. 305.

Construction for unforeseen requirements.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authori-

Report to Congressional committees.

zation will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Partial repeal.

(b) Section 103 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 638), is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Family housing.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

5 USC 171z-1.

7 USC 1691 note.

Various locations, France, 400 units.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

42 USC 1594-1594f.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARADCOM Tac Sites, 575 units.
Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 200 units.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, 200 units.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 27 units.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.
Fort Bliss, Texas, 1,000 units.
Fort Hood, Texas, 800 units.
Fort Riley, Kansas, 867 units.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 800 units.
Camp Irwin, California, 140 units.
Fort Ord, California, 500 units.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, 350 units.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, 1,200 units.

73 STAT. 305.

73 STAT. 306.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Losey, Puerto Rico, 150 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

71 Stat. 531.

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,613,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania, strike out "$464,000" and insert in place thereof "$597,000".

71 Stat. 531.

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "$1,936,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,276,000".

71 Stat. 532.

(4) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$4,663,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,051,000".

71 Stat. 533.

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$116,915,000" and "$294,394,000" and inserting in place thereof "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000", respectively. 72 Stat. 641.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects: Navy.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, $1,422,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $318,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Subsidence protective measures, $500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,146,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $3,497,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $7,353,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities, $701,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities; and, at Outlying Landing Field, Bravo, operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $5,147,000. 73 STAT. 306. 73 STAT. 307.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Community facilities, $400,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, $2,811,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $26,584,250.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, $305,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, $336,000.

(Marine Corps Air Station)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $48,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Troop housing, $2,216,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,851,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,051,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Utilities, $726,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,050,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $333,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; at Point Arguello, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, ammunition storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, at various Pacific islands, operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $30,000,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Military Medical Supply Agency, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, $113,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $100,000.

73 STAT. 307.

73 STAT. 308.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Utilities, $432,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and ammunition storage facilities, $328,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and utilities, $1,137,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $972,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $1,025,000.

Naval Communication Training Center, Corry Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, $1,000,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities, $4,712,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Real estate, $81,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, $144,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Naval Medical Research Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $75,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Cape Chiniak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $40,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $1,781,000.

Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilites, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,957,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, administrative facilities, and ground improvements, $3,179,000.

Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, $271,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,591,000.

Outside the United States

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $507,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Troop housing and community facilities, $4,133,000. 73 STAT. 308.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,640,000. 73 STAT. 309.

Naval Station, Bermuda: Troop housing, $295,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, $76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, $47,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, $5,400,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,796,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Utilities, $105,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $350,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $2,038,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sebana Seca, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $86,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $274,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,947,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $760,000.

Classified installations and facilities.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $18,495,000.

Construction for unforeseen requirements.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Report to Congressional committees.

73 STAT. 309.
73 STAT. 310.

Partial repeal.

(b) Section 203 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 646), is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Family housing.
5 USC 171z-1.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

7 USC 1691 note.

Naval Station, Bermuda, 100 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

42 USC 1594-1594f.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina, 40 units.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, 500 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, 106 units.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia, 225 units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida, 40 units.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, 320 units.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, 178 units.
Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.
Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, 500 units.
Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 42 units.
Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, 450 units.
Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, 142 units.
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, 150 units.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 229 units.
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$72,785,000", and inserting in place thereof "$72,935,000". 72 Stat. 647.

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$72,785,000", and "$212,833,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$72,935,000" and "$212,983,000". 72 Stat. 647.

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, by striking out "$511,000" and inserting in place thereof "$664,000". 70 Stat. 995.

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, by striking out "$273,000" and inserting in place thereof "$330,000". 72 Stat. 648.

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "$312,004,000", and "$460,716,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$312,214,000", and "$460,926,000". 72 Stat. 648.

73 STAT. 310.

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows: 73 STAT. 311.

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina, by striking out "$39,000" and inserting in place thereof "$52,000". 71 Stat. 538.

(2) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, by striking out "$1,469,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,596,000". 71 Stat. 538.

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey, by striking out "$130,000" and inserting in place thereof "$320,000". 71 Stat. 540.

(c) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$230,356,000", "$48,199,000", and "$337,611,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$230,496,000", "$48,389,000", and "$337,941,000". 71 Stat. 557.

TITLE III

Air Force.

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $766,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,309,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities. administrative facilities, community facilities, and troop housing, $2,779,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $955,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,755,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $523,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,371,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs Area, Colorado: Operational facilities and real estate, $10,000,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,234,000.

73 STAT. 311.

73 STAT. 312.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $255,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $866,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, $612,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, and real estate, $269,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,266,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Community facilities, and utilities, $1,181,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,150,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Ground improvements, $100,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Supply facilities, and utilities, $1,690,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $250,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $16,510,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, $341,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,180,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,548,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $2,676,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $900,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,036,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $12,000,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,690,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $787,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $833,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $909,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,952,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and real estate, $1,822,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $616,000.

73 STAT. 312.

73 STAT. 313.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,828,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities, $216,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,307,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $405,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,980,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $408,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $7,047,600.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $250,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $2,168,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,915,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, $391,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $20,000,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $822,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $750,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,083,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Supply facilities, $253,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, $110,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Supply facilities and ground improvements, $187,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,099,000.

73 STAT. 313.

73 STAT. 314.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,725,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,484,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and real estate, $425,000.

Chennault Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Utilities, and ground improvements, $350,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,915,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $621,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $264,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $895,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,071,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $292,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,445,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $158,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $1,461,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,661,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $6,364,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $410,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,036,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, $164,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $325,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $48,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $866,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities, $712,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $6,052,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,039,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $8,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,361,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,802,000. 73 STAT. 314.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $542,000. 73 STAT. 315.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,134,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $21,533,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $4,147,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,098,000.

Vandenburg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, $147,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and ground improvements, $942,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,406,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,484,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $800,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,468,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Hospital facilities, $1,820,200.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $540,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $151,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $557,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $2,249,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,150,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $505,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $246,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $74,651,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,199,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities,
73 STAT. 315. $1,299,000.

73 STAT. 316. Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,211,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $21,778,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Utilities, $106,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,309,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,996,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $15,160,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,908,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational facilities, $105,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $16,987,000.

Classified installations and facilities.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles and ballistic missile detection by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $417,541,000.

Construction for unforeseen requirements.

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1960, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Report to Congressional committees.

73 STAT. 316.
73 STAT. 317

(b) Section 303 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 655) is hereby repealed except for those public works projects thereunder concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Partial repeal.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Family housing.
5 USC 171z-1.

7 USC 1691 note.

Various locations, France, 300 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 203 units and community facilities.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 187 units and community facilities.

Burderop Park Hospital, United Kingdom, 152 units and community facilities.

Croughton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Greenham Common RAF Station, United Kingdom, 135 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 136 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 468 units and hospital facilities.

Ruislip (West) RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Sculthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 61 units and community facilities.

Welford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 31 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, community facilities.

Classified locations, 1,083 units and community facilities,

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

42 USC 1594-1594f.

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, 100 units.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, 470 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 400 units.

Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, 160 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 100 units.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, 350 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 150 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 400 units.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, 340 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 200 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 250 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 480 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 190 units.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 156 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 500 units.

73 STAT. 317. Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 670 units.

73 STAT. 318. Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 240 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 520 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 470 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 330 units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, 110 units.

Loring Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 100 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 560 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 230 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 530 units.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 820 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 400 units.

Travis Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

Perrin Air Force Base, Texas, 200 units.

Schilling Air Force Base, Kansas, 200 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 170 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 600 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 350 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 390 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Ladd Air Force Base, strike out "$1,630,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,895,000". 71 Stat. 549.

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$160,705,000", and "$607,460,000" and inserting in place thereof "$160,970,000", and "$607,725,000" respectively. 71 Stat. 557; 72 Stat. 659.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "$1,832,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,182,000". 72 Stat. 653.

(2) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$3,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,890,000".

(3) with respect to Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin, strike out "$15,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,655,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$542,161,000" and "$952,415,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,239,000" and "$954,493,000", respectively. 72 Stat. 660.

SEC. 307. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to make a study of the need for grade separation on "Old Loop No. 13" which traverses a portion of Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. Expenditure of $25,000 out of appropriations available to the Department of the Air Force is authorized for such study. Old Loop No. 13. Grade separation study.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise. Land improvements, etc. 70A Stat. 269, 590. 73 STAT. 318. 73 STAT. 319.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed— Appropriation.

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $72,363,100; outside the United States, $24,210,000; section 102, $81,830,000; section 103, $10,000,000; or a total of $188,403,100.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $113,356,250; outside the United States, $35,300,000; section 202, $18,495,000; section 203, $10,000,000; or a total of $177,151,250.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $296,897,800; outside the United States, $73,058,000; section 302, $417,541,000; section 303, $10,000,000; or a total of $797,496,800.

Cost variations and limitations.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

Contracts.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

70A Stat. 132.

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

70A Stat. 127.
10 USC 2301-2314.
Reports to Congress.

Repeals.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1960, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 31, 1957, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

73 STAT. 319.
73 STAT. 320.

Exceptions.

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1960, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $10,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of $6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 507 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 661), the authorization for:

(a) family housing at a classified installation in the amount of $2,234,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(b) classified facilities in the amount of $369,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 328);

(c) the United States Army, Europe, in the amount of $6,925,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(d) the Caribbean Command Area, in the amount of $1,060,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 944); 70 Stat. 994.

(e) classified facilities in the amount of $6,300,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 994);

(f) land acquisition and obstruction removal for flight clearance in the amount of $754,000 at various locations that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 332), as amended;

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $700,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" in the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 996), as amended;

(h) the authorization for the construction of family housing contained in the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), to the extent that section 504 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), made available such authorization for the construction of family housing for the Department of the Army at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and for the Department of the Air Force at Sundance, Wyoming, and at four locations outside the United States. 73 STAT. 320.

(i) the authorization for the construction of medical facilities in the amount of $5,000,000 for Camp Jackson (now Fort Jackson), South Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 326): *Provided*, That the unit cost per bed does not exceed $20,000. 73 STAT. 321.

(j) medical facilities in the amount of $2,667,000 for Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska, that is contained in title III, section 301, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 344): *Provided*, That this authorization shall expire on January 1, 1961, if not funded prior to that date.

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows: Housing facilities. Leases. 72 Stat. 662.

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1962, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of

such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

Family housing
72 Stat. 662.
42 USC 1594i.

SEC. 408. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622): *Provided*, That not more than five thousand units shall be contracted for under the authority of such section prior to June 30, 1964; and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

Exceptions.
69 Stat. 652.
42 USC 1594a.
72 Stat. 1460.

SEC. 409. The Secretary of a military department may acquire by lease for indefinite periods of time real property in the Ryukyu Islands needed by the United States Government. Rentals for such leases may be paid in advance from appropriations available for operation and maintenance except advance payments for periods in excess of five years which shall be from appropriations available for military construction.

SEC. 410. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

70A Stat. 269;
71 Stat. 555.

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

70A Stat. 468;
71 Stat. 556.

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

73 STAT. 321.
73 STAT. 322.

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below lieutenant commander."

70A Stat. 590;
71 Stat. 556.

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Not more than 10 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for officers of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,400 square feet or less for occupancy by officers holding grades below major."

SEC. 411. To the extent that any authority provided by the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636), or this Act, for the construction of appropriated fund family housing at locations in foreign countries is not utilized, the construction or acquisition of the number of housing units so authorized may be accomplished at the same locations under the authority of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended.

5 USC 171z-1.

Report to Congress.

SEC. 412. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall, on or before January 31, 1960, submit to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives complete and detailed information with respect to the various types and kinds of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels being procured by the armed forces of the United States, including the number of each type and kind procured and the cost thereof and the number of each type and kind proposed to be procured and the estimated cost thereof.

(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

SEC. 413. Section 109(a) of Public Law 85-685 (72 Stat. 636, 641) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "However, the Secretary of the Army shall not make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, for sale pursuant to this section, such lands, or interests therein, not exceeding one hundred and eighteen acres for channel straightening, and four hundred acres for a temporary spoil disposal area for a period of ten years, as the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary for the improvement or maintenance of the Houston Ship Channel Project."

Mortgage insurance.
71 Stat. 303.
12 USC 1748b.

SEC. 414. (a) Section 803(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*And provided further*, That no more mortgages shall be insured under this title after September 30, 1960, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date, and not more than twenty thousand family housing units shall be contracted for after June 30, 1959, pursuant to any mortgage insured under section 803 of this title after such date."

Housing units.
Limitation.

(b) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104(b), 204(b), and 304(b) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for after June 30, 1959, and before October 1, 1960, pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of twenty thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this section. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department.

Reports to Congressional committees.
73 STAT. 322.
73 STAT. 323.

69 Stat. 651.
42 USC 1594.

SEC. 415. Section 403 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) On request by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General shall furnish to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, an opinion as to the sufficiency of title to any property on which it is proposed to construct housing, or on which housing has been constructed, under this section. If the opinion of the Attorney General is that the title to any such property is good and sufficient, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to guarantee, or enter into a commitment to guarantee, the mortgagee, under a mortgage on such property which is insured under title VIII of the National Housing Act, against any losses that may thereafter arise from adverse claims to title. None of the proceeds of any mortgage loan hereafter insured under such title VIII shall be used for title search and title insurance costs: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines in the case of any housing project, that the financing of the construction of such project is impossible unless title insurance is provided, the Secretary may provide for the payment of the reasonable costs necessary for obtaining title search and title insurance. Any payments by the Secretary hereunder shall be made from the revolving fund established under section 404(g). Any determination by the Secretary under the foregoing proviso shall be set forth in writing, together with the reasons therefor. The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be promptly notified of

63 Stat. 570.
12 USC 1748-1748i.

70 Stat. 1111.
42 USC 1594a.

Notification to Congressional committees.

each such determination, and of the amount of any payment made by the Secretary for title search and title insurance costs."

SEC. 416. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;
(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;
(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;
(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 417. Section 4 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78), is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$900,000".

Condemnation proceedings. 72 Stat. 663. 42 USC 1594a.

SEC. 418. Section 404(c)(2) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking the first two sentences thereof and substituting the following language: "In any condemnation proceedings instituted to acquire any such housing, or interest therein, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421). The amount of such deposit for the purpose of this section shall not in any case be less than an amount equal to the actual cost of the housing (not including the value of any improvements installed or constructed with appropriated funds) as certified by the sponsor or owner of the project to the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to any statute or any regulation issued by the Federal Housing Commissioner, reduced by the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at the time possession is surrendered, but any such deposit shall not include any excess mortgage proceeds or 'windfalls,' kickbacks and rebates received in connection with the construction of said housing as determined by the Department of Defense, or any other Federal agency. The amount of such deposit in any case where the sponsor or owner has not certified the cost of the project to the Federal Housing Commissioner at the time of the enactment of this Act, shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, in accordance with the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421): *Provided*, That in the event there is withdrawn from the registry of the court by the owner or sponsor a sum of money in excess of the final award of just compensation, this excess shall be repaid to the United States plus a sum equal to 4 per centum per annum on such excess from the time such sum is deposited in the registry of the court: *Provided further*, That any court in which money is deposited as provided in this section shall require the furnishing of security by the owner to protect the United States from any loss by reason of a final award of just compensation of less than the amount deposited: *And provided further*, That the deposit required to be made by this section shall be without prejudice to any party in the determination of just compensation. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application and subject to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 per centum of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding."

40 USC 258a.

73 STAT. 323.

73 STAT. 324.

40 USC 258a-258e.

Reports to Congress.

SEC. 419. The Secretary of Defense shall not later than September 15, 1959, report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives the results of a complete review of all pre-

viously authorized surface-to-air missile sites with the assurance (1) that the review reveals the military necessity for the construction of the sites selected, (2) that the performance and capability of the missiles selected for the respective sites are in consonance with military requirements so as to eliminate, insofar as possible, overlapping of missions and duplication of weapons systems, and (3) that particular attention shall be given to the feasibility of modifying or expediting any of the missile programs for either defense or offense.

SEC. 420. In carrying out in a foreign country any project authorized by this Act or any other Military Construction Act heretofore or hereafter enacted, currencies of such country acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress) shall, to the extent available and feasible, be used in lieu of dollars. The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for any foreign currencies so utilized in carrying out such projects. 68 Stat. 454. 7 USC 1691 note.

SEC. 421. Titles I, II, and III of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1959". Short title.

TITLE V

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 501. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces: Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959. 70A Stat. 120. 10 USC 2231-2238.

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

Aberdeen, South Dakota: Training facilities, $168,000.
Akron (Number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $574,000.
Allentown-Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $302,000.
Anderson, Indiana: Training facilities, $136,000. 73 STAT. 324.
Ann Arbor, Michigan: Training facilities, $317,000. 73 STAT. 325.
Aurora, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
Bardstown, Kentucky: Training facilities, $160,000.
Beaver Dam, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $176,000.
Bellaire, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.
Bloomington, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.
Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, $302,000.
Bridgeport-Fairfield, Connecticut: Training facilities addition, $64,000.
Bronx, New York: Training facilities, $98,000.
Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Butler, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.
Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
Chicago Heights, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
Chico, California: Training facilities, $168,000.
Cumberland, Maryland: Training facilities, $288,000.
Dallas (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities addition, $64,000.
Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, $48,000.
Delaware, Ohio: Training facilities, $302,000.
Detroit (Number 1), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.
Detroit (Number 2), Michigan: Training facilities, $602,000.
Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, $317,000.
East Saint Louis, Illinois: Training facilities, $156,000.
El Dorado, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Evanston, Illinois: Training facilities, $574,000.

Flint, Michigan: Training facilities, $551,000.
Fort Smith, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Fulton, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.
Gadsden, Alabama: Training facilities, $144,000.
Galveston, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.
Glens Falls, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
Hammond, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.
Harrison, Arkansas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Jefferson City, Missouri: Training facilities, $288,000.
Joliet, Illinois: Training facilities, $302,000.
Kankakee, Illinois: Training facilities, $168,000.
La Crosse, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $317,000.
Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities, $152,000.
Malone, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
Mankato, Minnesota: Training facilities, $176,000.
Marion, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.
Meadville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $168,000.
Milwaukee (West), Wisconsin: Training facilities, $602,000.
Morristown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $317,000.
Mount Vernon, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.
Muncie, Indiana: Training facilities, $168,000.
Muskogee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $288,000.
New Orleans (Number 1), Louisiana: Training facilities, $520,000.
Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Okmulgee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.
Olean, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $176,000.
Painesville, Ohio: Training facilities, $168,000.
Pittsburgh (Number 3), Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $574,000.
Purcell, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $160,000.
73 STAT. 325. Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.
73 STAT. 326. Rutland, Vermont: Training facilities, $143,000.
Sacramento, California: Training facilities addition, $61,000.
Saint Cloud, Minnesota: Training facilities, $330,000.
Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $61,000.
San Antonio (Number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $520,000.
San Diego, California: Training facilities, $526,000.
San Marcos, Texas: Training facilities, $152,000.
Santa Barbara, California: Training facilities, $136,000.
Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $259,000.
Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities addition, $73,000.
Uniontown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $220,000.
Vallejo, California: Training facilities, $302,000.
Washington, Iowa: Training facilities, $160,000.
Washington, Missouri: Training facilities, $160,000.
Washington, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $136,000.
Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $168,000.
Westminster, Maryland: Training facilities, $160,000.
Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $1,788,000.
Land acquisition: Training facilities, $800,000.
San Jose, California: Parking lot and drill grounds, $1.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)

Amsterdam, New York: Training facilities, $55,000.
Anchorage, Alaska: Training facilities, $276,000.
Baltimore (Dundalk), Maryland: Training facilities, $215,000.

Bayamon, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
Beebe, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
Belen, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000.
Benson, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
Birmingham, Alabama: Training facilities, $160,000.
Bound Brook, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Buffalo, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.
Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $70,000.
Cape May Court House, New Jersey: Training facilities, $250,000.
Colby, Kansas: Training facilities, $80,000.
Coleville, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.
De Witt, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
Donna, Texas: Training facilities, $99,000.
Durant, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
Elyria, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.
Enosburg Falls, Vermont: Training facilities, $169,000.
Farmington, Missouri: Training facilities, $115,000.
Flemington, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Freehold, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Gainesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.
Greeley, Colorado: Training facilities, $132,000.
Hackettstown, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Hazen, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
Idaho Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, $105,000.
Inman, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.
Iuka, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $375,000.
Jonesville, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.
Lancaster, Ohio: Training facilities, $160,000.
Leominster, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $200,000.
Martindale Army Air Field, Texas: Training facilities, $210,000.
Milan, Tennessee: Training facilities, $91,000. 73 STAT. 326.
Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000. 73 STAT. 327.
Mount Olive, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.
New Brockton, Alabama: Training facilities, $70,000.
Newton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Norwalk, Ohio: Training facilities, $140,000.
Olean, New York: Training facilities, $46,000.
Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $450,000.
Oswego, New York: Training facilities, $52,000.
Plentywood, Montana: Training facilities, $63,000.
Ponce, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
Princeton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $60,000.
Quitman, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Ronceverte, West Vrginia: Training facilities, $54,000.
Roswell, New Mexico: Training facilities, $200,000.
Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $565,000.
Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, $160,000.
San German, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $150,000.
Savannah, Georgia: Training facilities, $600,000.
Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, $60,000.
Tomahawk, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $160,000.
Troy, New York: Training facilities, $47,000.
Tuckerton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $80,000.
Webb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $54,000.
Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $84,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NONARMORY)

Bismarck, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.
Buckhannon, West Virginia: Administrative and supply facilities, $206,000.
Camp Drum, New York: Maintenance facilities, $308,000.
Hayward, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.
Jersey City, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $49,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $838,000.
Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $348,000.
Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $59,000.
Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities and utilities, $771,000.
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $563,000.
Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, $178,000.
Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $192,000.
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $76,000.
Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $797,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Beaumont, Texas: Operational facilities, $65,000.
73 STAT. 327.
73 STAT. 328.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Champaign, Illinois: Training facilities, $70,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $655,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas: Operational facilities, $204,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Kingsville, Texas: Training facilities, $35,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, New Haven, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $323,000.
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $697,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $226,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Operational facilities, $104,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Chicago, Illinois: Training facilities, $518,000.
Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities and land acquisition, $330,000.
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Training facilities, $370,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Rafael, California: Training facilities, $490,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tampa, Florida: Training facilities, $391,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Supply facilities, and operational facilities, $364,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Troop housing and utilities, $92,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $823,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Troop housing, $43,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,890,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Supply facilities, $105,000.

Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $188,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational facilities, $105,000.

New Orleans Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $274,000.

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000. 73 STAT. 328.

Bradley Field, Hartford, Connecticut: Maintenance facilities, $123,000. 73 STAT. 329.

Buckley Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Operational facilities, $591,000.

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vermont: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $82,000.

Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $245,000.

Gore Field, Great Falls, Montana: Maintenance facilities and operational facilities, $665,000.

Gowen Field, Boise, Idaho: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Haleakala Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Maui, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $446,000.

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $3,222,000.

Hancock Field, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, $596,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $259,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Kokee Aircraft Control and Warning Facility, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $283,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,323,000.

Memphis Municipal Airport, Memphis, Tennessee: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,825,000.

Ontario Municipal Airport, Ontario, California: Training facilities, $233,000.

Peoria Municipal Airport, Greater Peoria, Illinois: Operational facilities, $430,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $943,000.

Sioux Falls (Foss Field), Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $105,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Tucson Municipal Airport, Tucson, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, $123,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $317,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection: *Provided*, That the first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to facilities authorized by this subsection.

Notification to Congress.
73 STAT. 329.
73 STAT. 330.
72 Stat. 665.

Sec. 502. (a) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)" in clause (1) of section 603 by striking out the following:

72 Stat. 665.

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $652,000."

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $652,000."

(b) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (2) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts, strike out "$740,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,030,000".

(2) With respect to various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, strike out "$300,000" and insert in place thereof "$480,000".

(c) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Canton, Ohio, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$61,000".

(2) With respect to Greenwood, South Carolina, strike out "$85,000" and insert in place thereof "$117,000".

(3) With respect to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, strike out "$99,000" and insert in place thereof "$136,000".

(d) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause (3) of section 603 by striking out the following:

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $206,000."
"Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, $300,000."
"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $57,000."
"Houston (Number 1), Texas: Training facilities, $323,000."
"Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $45,000."
"Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, $130,000."
"Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, $175,000."
"Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, $15,000."

(e) Public Law 85–685 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 606 "$11,886,000" and inserting in place thereof "$10,582,000"; and by striking out in clause (2) (b) of section 606 "$11,976,000" and inserting in place thereof "$12,446,000"; and by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$28,330,000" and inserting in place thereof "$27,079,000". Appropriation. 72 Stat. 672.

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise. Land improvements, etc. 31 USC 529. 40 USC 259, 267. 70A Stat. 269, 590. 40 USC 255.

SEC. 504. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 501 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed— Appropriation. 73 STAT. 330. 73 STAT. 331.

(1) for Department of the Army:
(a) Army Reserve, $20,916,000;
(b) Army National Guard of the United States, $8,806,000.
(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,300,000;
(3) for Department of the Air Force:
(a) Air Force Reserve, $4,093,000;
(b) Air National Guard of the United States, $15,580,000.

SEC. 505. Any of the amounts named in section 501 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army Reserve, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1) (a), (1) (b), (2), (3) (a), and (3) (b) of section 504, respectively. Cost variation and limitation.

SEC. 506. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959". Short title.

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Santa Cruz, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four and five-tenths acres of land, more or less, comprising the United States Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site and being a part of the lands known as the United States Coast Guard Santa Cruz Light Station, situated on the northerly side of West Cliff Drive, approximately seven hundred feet south of Pelton Avenue, in the city and county of Santa Cruz, California, and in exchange for said conveyance to accept on behalf of the United States of America from the city of Santa U.S. Army Reserve Center Lighthouse Point site. Conveyance.

73 STAT. 331.

Cruz a deed conveying fee simple title to not less than four acres of land situated within the city of Santa Cruz, California, to be utilized as the site for a United States Army Reserve Center: *Provided*, That the city of Santa Cruz pay to the United States a sum of money representing, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, the aggregate of (1) the amount by which the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Army exceeds the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor; (2) the amount heretofore expended by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed construction of the United States Army Reserve Center at Lighthouse Point for work and materials which cannot be utilized in connection with the construction of the United States Army Reserve Center on the site to be acquired from the city; and (3) the amount by which the costs for providing adequate foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation for the construction of a United States Army Reserve Center at the site to be acquired from the city exceeds the estimated costs for providing foundations, sewer and water facilities, and site preparation at the Lighthouse Point site.

Miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 602. The moneys received by the Secretary of the Army under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts except that any moneys received under section 601 (2) and (3) of this title shall be credited to the appropriation to which such costs are charged.

Approved August 10, 1959.